A/68/16*

United Nations

Report of the Committee for Programme and Coordination

Fifty-third session
(3-28 June 2013)

General Assembly
Official Records
Sixty-eighth Session
Supplement No. 16

Please recycle

A/68/16*

General Assembly
Official Records
Sixty-eighth Session
Supplement No. 16

Report of the Committee for Programme and Coordination

Fifty-third session
(3-28 June 2013)

United Nations • New York, 2013

---

* Reissued for technical reasons on 14 August 2013.

Note

Symbols of United Nations documents are composed of letters combined with figures. Mention of such a symbol indicates a reference to a United Nations document.

ISSN 0255-2213

[3 July 2013]

Contents

Chapter			Page
I.	Organization of the session		1
	A.	Agenda	1
	B.	Election of officers	2
	C.	Attendance	3
	D.	Documentation	4
	E.	Adoption of the report of the Committee	4
II.	Programme questions		5
	A.	Proposed programme budget for the biennium 2014-2015	5
		Proposed revisions to the Regulations and Rules Governing Programme Planning, the Programme Aspects of the Budget, the Monitoring of Implementation and the Methods of Evaluation	5
		Report of the Secretary-General on consolidated changes to the biennial programme plan as reflected in the proposed programme budget for the biennium 2014-2015	5
		Programme 3: Disarmament	7
		Programme 10: Trade and development	8
		Programme 11: Environment	12
		Programme 12: Human settlements	20
		Programme 15: Economic and social development in Africa	23
		Programme 16: Economic and social development in Asia and the Pacific	25
	B.	Evaluation	26
		1. Strengthening the role of evaluation and the application of evaluation findings on programme design, delivery and policy directives	26
		2. Programme evaluation of the United Nations Environment Programme	30
		3. Evaluation of the Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs	32
		4. Evaluation of the United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime	33
		5. Evaluation of the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees	35
III.	Coordination questions		37
	A.	Annual overview report of the United Nations System Chief Executives Board for Coordination for 2012	37

B. United Nations system support for the New Partnership for Africa's Development 40
IV. Reports of the Joint Inspection Unit 44
A. Strategic planning in the United Nations system 44
B. Financing for humanitarian operations in the United Nations system 47
V. Provisional agenda for the fifty-fourth session of the Committee 51
Annexes
I. Agenda for the fifty-third session of the Committee 53
II. List of documents before the Committee at its fifty-third session 54

Chapter I
Organization of the session

1. The Committee for Programme and Coordination held its organizational session (1st meeting) on 25 April 2013 and its substantive session from 3 to 28 June 2013 at United Nations Headquarters. It held a total of 19 meetings and numerous informal and informal-informal consultations. The Committee welcomed the continued use of a restricted website, which had been established for the previous session, to enable easy access to relevant and timely in-session documentation.

A. Agenda

2. The agenda for the fifty-third session, adopted by the Committee at its organizational session (1st meeting), is contained in annex I to the present report.

Selection of reports of the Joint Inspection Unit

3. At its 1st meeting, on 25 April, the attention of the Committee was drawn to the note by the Secretariat (E/AC.51/2013/L.2), which stated that, in accordance with paragraph 6 of its terms of reference contained in the annex to Economic and Social Council resolution 2008 (LX), the Committee had been invited to select one or more reports from the reports listed below for consideration at its fifty-third session:

(a) Report of the Joint Inspection Unit entitled "Strategic planning in the United Nations system" (A/67/873) and the comments of the Secretary-General and of the United Nations System Chief Executives Board for Coordination thereon (A/67/873/Add.1);

(b) Report of the Joint Inspection Unit entitled "Financing for humanitarian operations in the United Nations system" (A/67/867) and the comments of the Secretary-General and of the United Nations System Chief Executives Board for Coordination thereon (A/67/867/Add.1);

(c) Report of the Joint Inspection Unit entitled "Evaluation of UN-Oceans" (A/67/400) and the comments of the Secretary-General and of the United Nations System Chief Executives Board for Coordination thereon (A/67/400/Add.1).

4. The Committee, at its 2nd meeting, held a discussion on the consideration of agenda item 5, "Report(s) of the Joint Inspection Unit", and decided, at that stage, not to consider the report of the Unit entitled "Evaluation of UN-Oceans" (A/67/400) and the comments of the Secretary-General and of the United Nations System Chief Executives Board for Coordination thereon (A/67/400/Add 1).

5. Recalling the recommendation adopted at its forty-ninth session, which had been endorsed by the General Assembly in its resolution 64/229, that the role of coordination bodies, including the Joint Inspection Unit, should be enhanced through improved cooperation in order to increase planning efficiency and to prevent duplication of efforts within the United Nations system, the Committee commended the Unit for intensifying its efforts to introduce to the Committee reports relevant to the function of the Committee, bearing in mind paragraphs 4 (d) and 4 (e) of article 11 of the statute of the Unit.

Programme of work

6. At its 2nd meeting, on 3 June, the attention of the Committee was drawn to the note by the Secretariat on the status of documentation (E/AC.51/2013/L.1/Rev.1), listing the documents for consideration by the Committee.

7. Also at its 2nd meeting, the Committee had before it an informal paper setting out a tentative and provisional programme of work for the session. The Committee approved the programme of work, with the understanding that adjustments would be made by the Bureau, as necessary, during the course of the session in order to take the pace of discussions into account.

B. Election of officers

8. At its 1st meeting, on 25 April, the Committee elected, by acclamation, Yuri Ambrazevich (Belarus) and Justin Kisoka (United Republic of Tanzania) as Vice-Chairs and Hélène Petit (France) as Rapporteur of the Committee for the session.

9. At its 2nd meeting, on 3 June, the Committee elected, by acclamation, Rashid Bayat Mokhtari (Islamic Republic of Iran) as Chair of the Committee for the session.

10. Also at its 2nd meeting, the Committee elected, by acclamation, Marita Puertas (Peru) as Vice-Chair of the Committee for the session.

11. The members of the Bureau for the fifty-third session of the Committee are listed below:

Chair:

Rashid Bayat Mokhtari (Islamic Republic of Iran)

Vice-Chairs:

Yuri Ambrazevich (Belarus)
Marita Puertas (Peru)
Justin Kisoka (United Republic of Tanzania)

Rapporteur:

Hélène Petit (France)

12. At the 2nd meeting, on 3 June, before the election of officers, the representative of the United States of America made a statement regarding his delegation's rejoining of the Committee after a hiatus of a number of years. His delegation would not participate in the fifty-third session, however, due to the fact that in the regional pattern of rotation for chairmanship of the Committee, which for the fifty-third session would be held by a member of the Group of Asia-Pacific States, the Islamic Republic of Iran had been nominated to chair the Committee. Statements in response were made by the representatives of the Islamic Republic of Iran and Cuba.

C. Attendance

13. The following States Members of the United Nations were represented on the Committee:

Algeria	Iran (Islamic Republic of)
Antigua and Barbuda	Italy
Argentina	Japan
Belarus	Kazakhstan
Benin	Malaysia
Botswana	Pakistan
Brazil	Peru
Bulgaria	Republic of Korea
Cameroon	Republic of Moldova
China	Russian Federation
Cuba	United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland
El Salvador	United Republic of Tanzania
Eritrea	United States of America
France	Uruguay
Guinea	Zimbabwe
Guinea-Bissau	

14. The following States Members of the United Nations were represented by observers:

Austria	Lebanon
Belgium	Mexico
Côte d'Ivoire	Monaco
Egypt	Nigeria
Ethiopia	Sweden
Germany	Switzerland
Iraq	United Arab Emirates
Kenya	

15. The following intergovernmental organization was represented as an observer: European Union.

16. Also present at the session were the Under-Secretary-General for Internal Oversight Services; the Secretary of the United Nations System Chief Executives Board for Coordination (CEB); the Under-Secretary-General, Special Adviser on Africa; the Executive Director of the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP); the Under-Secretary-General and High Representative for Disarmament Affairs; the Executive Secretary of the Economic Commission for Africa; the Executive Director of the United Nations Human Settlements Programme (UN-Habitat); and other senior officials of the Secretariat.

D. Documentation

17. The list of documents before the Committee at its fifty-third session is set out in annex II to the present report.

E. Adoption of the report of the Committee

18. At its 19th meeting, on 28 June, the Rapporteur introduced the draft report of the Committee (E/AC.51/2013/L.4 and Add.1 to 18).

19. Before the adoption of the draft report, the Secretary of the Committee had orally corrected a provisional version of addendum 17 to the draft report (E/AC.51/2013/L.4/Add.17) on the annual overview report of CEB for 2012.

20. The representative of the Russian Federation had also orally amended the provisional version of addendum 17. Comments on the oral amendments were made by the representative of Bulgaria.

21. At the same meeting, the Committee adopted the draft report on the work of its fifty-third session (E/AC.51/2013/L.4 and Add.1 to 18), as orally corrected and amended.

22. Before the closure of the session, statements were made by the representatives of Cuba, Benin, Argentina, Japan, Italy, Uruguay, Bulgaria and Cameroon.

Chapter II
Programme questions

A. Proposed programme budget for the biennium 2014-2015

Proposed revisions to the Regulations and Rules Governing Programme Planning, the Programme Aspects of the Budget, the Monitoring of Implementation and the Methods of Evaluation

23. At its 8th, 14th and 18th meetings, on 6, 13 and 19 June 2013, the Committee considered the report of the Secretary-General on proposed revisions to the Regulations and Rules Governing Programme Planning, the Programme Aspects of the Budget, the Monitoring of Implementation and the Methods of Evaluation (A/68/74).

24. It was recalled that at its fifty-second session the Committee had recommended that the General Assembly request the Secretary-General to present the above-mentioned report, based on changes approved by the Assembly in its various resolutions on programme planning (see A/67/16, para. 71). That recommendation had been endorsed by the Assembly in its resolution 67/236.

25. Owing to the lack of time, the Committee decided to continue its consideration of the question at its fifty-fifth session.

Report of the Secretary-General on consolidated changes to the biennial programme plan as reflected in the proposed programme budget for the biennium 2014-2015

Introduction

26. At its 9th meeting, on 11 June 2013, the Committee considered the report of the Secretary-General on consolidated changes to the biennial programme plan as reflected in the proposed programme budget for the biennium 2014-2015 (A/68/75).

27. The representative of the Secretary-General introduced the report and responded to queries raised during its consideration by the Committee.

Discussion

28. Many delegations expressed concern at the brevity of the introductory statement of the report, most notably that it did not highlight the main changes to the biennial programme plan or provide clarification as to the methodology applicable for the submission of the proposed changes.

29. Clarification was sought by a delegation on the reasons why the proposed programme budget fascicles for the biennium 2014-2015 had been presented to the Committee as part of the documentation for the current session. Other delegations queried why, bearing in mind that all proposed programme budget fascicles for the biennium 2014-2015 are required to be available, if not formally introduced, to the Committee, some budget fascicles were still not available for review by the Committee and, therefore, had not been issued in accordance with the six-week rule for documentation to be available in advance of the start of the session of the Committee. Clarification was sought on the delay in the availability of the fascicles, which was attributed by the Secretariat to the adoption by the General Assembly of

the budget outline for the biennium 2014-2015. A delegation remarked that budget matters were not within the purview of the Committee.

30. A few delegations expressed the view that, in accordance with the provisions of resolution 58/269, they had expected reporting on all changes in the biennial programme plan that had been approved by the General Assembly. In addition, a few delegations noted that although they were still analysing the fascicles for consistency between the fascicles and the biennial programme plan, there was an example where the indicator of achievement in the fascicle differed from that in the approved biennial programme plan. One delegation expressed the view that if the purpose of making the proposed programme budget fascicles available to the Committee was to ensure the accuracy of the approved biennial programme plan, as contained in the fascicles, that was an administrative function that could be performed elsewhere.

31. Clarification was sought on the legislative basis for the proposed changes to programme 3, Disarmament, in the light of General Assembly resolution 58/269. The view was expressed that the methodological aspects of the proposed changes to programme 3, needed to be discussed. A delegation noted that while the issue would subsequently be considered in detail when the report on the changes to programme 3 was formally introduced in the Committee, a number of clarifications were needed, including on the change of the name of an administrative branch and on changes made in the structure of the subprogrammes. Another delegation sought clarification as to the regulation 4.13 and rule 104.8 cited by the Secretariat as the basis for putting forward the changes under the Programme, notably that it was the view of the delegation that it was not in compliance with those provisions.

32. It was noted that the biennial programme plan and priorities for the period 2014-2015 (A/67/6/Rev.1) contained the biennial programme for programme 11, Environment, which had not been approved by the General Assembly. Concern was expressed by a delegation over the lack of efficiency by the Secretariat in preparing the document.

Conclusions and recommendations

33. **The Committee considered that the objectives of the Organization, the expected accomplishments of the Secretariat and the indicators of achievement, as set out in the biennial programme plan, could be improved to indicate more clearly the impact of the activities implemented and recommended that the General Assembly request the Secretary-General, on the basis of the experience gained during the implementation of results-based budgeting, to present proposals for such improvement to the Committee at its fifty-fifth session.**

34. **The Committee noted the inclusion of programme 11, Environment, in the biennial programme plan and priorities for the period 2014-2015 and recalled that the General Assembly, on the basis of the Committee's recommendation, had not approved programme 11. Therefore, the Committee recommended that the General Assembly request the Secretary-General to submit a corrigendum to the biennial programme plan.**

Programme 3
Disarmament

35. At its 13th meeting, on 13 June 2013, the Committee considered the report of the Secretary-General on consolidated changes to the biennial programme plan as reflected in the proposed programme budget for the biennium 2014-2015 (A/68/75).

36. The Under-Secretary-General for Disarmament introduced the report and responded to queries raised by the Committee during its consideration of the report.

Discussion

37. Appreciation and support were expressed for the programme and the work of the Office for Disarmament Affairs. Delegations noted the explanations provided for changes, which were introduced in the overall orientation of the programme and subprogrammes 1 and 5.

38. The view was expressed that detailed information should be provided to have a clear understanding of the proposed changes and to better assist the Committee in making good recommendations to the General Assembly.

39. A number of delegations expressed concern regarding the presentation of the changes resulting from the movement, from subprogramme 1 to subprogramme 5, of activities associated with expected accomplishment (c) and the related indicators of achievement (c) (i), (ii) and (iii) linked to the United Nations Disarmament Fellowship Programme.

40. Some delegations questioned the need for presenting changes in the programme at the current stage, in the absence of new mandates that justified such changes. In that context, they questioned, in particular, the proposal to transfer the United Nations Disarmament Fellowship Programme from Geneva to New York. Further explanation was sought to determine the rationale and the added value of such a transfer, taking into account that the centre of disarmament issues was located in Geneva. The view was expressed that such a proposal would create difficulties for some delegations and queries were raised to clarify the efficiencies to be gained by the Secretariat as a result. In addition, delegations expressed the opinion that, in practical terms, the proposal to transfer the Fellowship Programme to subprogramme 5 would give priority to regional issues over those of a global nature. Clarification was sought as to how the Office for Disarmament Affairs envisaged compliance with General Assembly resolutions, for example in ensuring geographical representation and gender balance in the selection of candidates for the Fellowship Programme.

41. Concern was expressed about the proposal to change the title of the branch which had substantive responsibility for the implementation of subprogramme 1, Multilateral negotiations on arms limitation and disarmament, from the "Conference on Disarmament Secretariat and Conference Support Branch" at the United Nations Office at Geneva, to the "Geneva Branch". The view was expressed that despite the explanations provided by the Secretariat, such a proposal decreased the visibility of the activities performed by the Secretariat related to the Conference on Disarmament. While it was noted that the objective of the proposed change to the title was to shorten and simplify the name, the view was also expressed that the name change itself did not reflect the mandate of the Office. Moreover, it would have some implications and would detract from the importance of the Conference.

42. Some delegations expressed serious concern about such a proposal and sought clarification regarding the impact of the name change at the intergovernmental level and whether prior consultations had been held with Member States on the proposal.

43. Clarification was also sought regarding the expectation of the Secretariat concerning the strategy related to furthering collaboration with the United Nations Institute for Disarmament Research, as reflected in paragraph 7 of the report (A/68/75), and whether the Secretariat collaborated with similar institutes in New York.

44. A few delegations noted the changes in the organizational structure and post distribution as reflected in annex I to document A/68/6 (Sect. 4), in particular under subprogramme 2. They expressed concern about the impact of those changes on programme delivery, given the move of one post at the D-1 level from subprogramme 5 to subprogramme 2. In that connection, clarification was sought regarding the rationale for having two posts at the D-1 level under subprogramme 2 as a result of that change.

45. Concern was expressed by some delegations with regard to peace and security in Central Africa. Clarification was sought as to whether the situation in the Sahel region and the impact of the dissemination of arms on all States in the region had been taken into account, together with the inclusion of specific measures to combat and eradicate the illicit trade in small arms and light weapons.

46. Further clarification was sought regarding the recommendations made by the Secretariat to combat the illicit circulation of conventional weapons and strengthen the customary actions of the United Nations to serve peace and security in Central Africa.

47. Some delegations sought clarification about the impact of the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons, in particular the transfer of appropriate technology for peaceful uses, as a specific narrative to that effect had not been provided under the expected accomplishments of the programme.

48. The need for consultation with the First Committee on the proposed changes was also highlighted by some delegations.

Conclusions and recommendations

49. **The Committee, at the current stage, did not recommend that the General Assembly approve the proposed changes to the narrative of programme 3, Disarmament, contained in the report of the Secretary-General (A/68/75).**

Programme 10
Trade and development

50. At its 16th meeting, on 14 June 2013, the Committee considered the report of the Secretary-General on consolidated changes to the biennial programme plan as reflected in the proposed programme budget for the biennium 2014-2015 (A/68/75).

51. The Deputy Secretary-General of the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development (UNCTAD) introduced the report and responded to queries raised during its consideration by the Committee.

Discussion

52. Appreciation was expressed for programme 10, Trade and development, of the biennial programme plan and priorities for the period 2014-2015 (A/67/6/Rev.1) and for the work of UNCTAD, especially in the context of subprogramme 5, Africa, least developed countries and special programmes.

53. Several delegations sought clarification as to whether UNCTAD had taken into account all the decisions emanating from its thirteenth session, held in Doha from 21 to 26 April 2012 (the Doha Mandate). In particular, delegations expressed concern that the biennial programme plan did not reflect all the decisions of the Conference.

54. Concern was expressed by some delegations regarding the fact that, despite the holding of the thirteenth session of UNCTAD, the proposed programme budget did not fully take into account the Doha Mandate, especially with regard to middle-income countries.

55. Concern was also expressed with regard to the lack of consideration given to the conclusions and recommendations of the Committee at its fifty-second session, as approved by the General Assembly in its resolution 67/236.

56. One delegation expressed the view that the issue of middle-income countries was an important one. In that connection, it sought clarification regarding the phrases "some middle-income countries", "middle-income countries most in need" and "other relevant decisions". In particular, it wished to know who decided on the countries to which "some" referred, what was the basis for determining which middle-income countries were most in need and which were not and what was meant by "relevant". In addition, the delegation expressed concern regarding the inclusion of the term "relevant", given that the Committee, in its report on the work of its fifty-second session (A/67/16), had already recommended its deletion.

57. A number of delegations expressed concern regarding the omission of the term "middle-income countries" from the objectives, expected accomplishments and indicators of achievement of several subprogrammes, contrary to the specific recommendation of the Committee in its previous report (A/67/16).

58. The view was expressed that programme 10, Trade and development, should include the issue of sustainable development and that, while prioritizing the least developed countries, small island developing States and landlocked developing countries, it was essential for UNCTAD to cover all developing countries, including middle-income countries. In addition, the importance of integrating developed countries and their supply chains, with an emphasis on South-South cooperation and North-South cooperation, was stressed.

59. Lastly, a query was raised as to the direction of the discussion within the Trade and Development Board of UNCTAD with regard to the special event and publications to mark the fiftieth anniversary of UNCTAD, in 2014.

Conclusions and recommendations

60. The Committee noted that some of the changes to the narrative of programme 10, Trade and development, as approved by the General Assembly in its resolution 67/236, had not been reflected in the report of the Secretary-General (A/68/75). The Committee therefore reiterated the following:

Overall orientation

Paragraph 20

At the end of the second sentence, delete the phrase "and other relevant decisions".

Subprogramme 2
Investment and enterprise

Indicators of achievement

In indicator of achievement (b) (ii), after the phrase "developing countries", add the phrase "and countries with economies in transition".

Strategy

Paragraph 24

In the last sentence, replace (b) with the following:

"(b) helping developing countries, middle-income countries and countries with economies in transition, at their request, to strengthen their capacity to formulate and implement integrated policies, develop an enabling environment and participate in discussions related to international investment;".

In the last sentence, replace (c) with the following:

"(c) supporting efforts by developing countries, middle-income countries and countries with economies in transition to build productive capacities and internationally competitive firms;".

Subprogramme 3
International trade

Component 1
Strengthening international trade

Expected accomplishments of the Secretariat

In expected accomplishment (b), after the phrase "developing countries", add the phrase ", middle-income countries".

In expected accomplishment (d), after the phrase "developing countries", add the phrase ", middle-income countries and countries with economies in transition".

Indicators of achievement

In indicator of achievement (d) (i), after the phrase "developing countries", add the phrase "and countries with economies in transition".

In indicator of achievement (d) (ii), after the phrase "developing countries", add the phrase "and countries with economies in transition".

Component 2
Commodities

Strategy

Paragraph 27

In the second sentence, after the word "Africa", add the words ", middle-income countries and countries with economies in transition,".

Subprogramme 4
Technology and logistics

Strategy

Paragraph 28

In the second sentence, after the word "Africa", add the phrase "middle-income countries, countries with economies in transition", and, after the phrase "small economies", delete ", as well as countries with economies in transition and some middle-income countries according to their needs".

61. **The Committee recommended that the General Assembly approve the changes to the narrative of programme 10, Trade and development, as set out in the report of the Secretary-General (A/68/75) and in section 12 of the proposed programme budget for the biennium 2014-2015 (A/68/6 (Sect. 12)), subject to the following modifications:**

Subprogramme 2
Investment and enterprise

Objective of the Organization

After the words "as well as", add the phrase "middle-income countries, countries with economies in transition,".

Strategy

Paragraph 24

In the second sentence, delete the words "some" and "most in need".

Outputs[1]

Paragraph 12.51, subparagraph (c) (i)

Replace the phrase "assistance to some middle-income countries that are most in need" with the phrase "assistance to middle-income countries, according to their needs, and to economies in transition".

[1] See A/68/6 (Sect. 12).

Subprogramme 3
International trade

Component 1
Strengthening international trade

Strategy

Paragraph 26 (f)

Delete the word "some".

Paragraph 26 (i)

After the words "increased participation", add the words "and upscaling".

Paragraph 26 (o)

Replace the paragraph with the following: "Addressing issues at the interface of trade and environment in the context of sustainable development, fostering low-carbon development, including through technology transfers, ensuring development gains and seizing trade opportunities related to the emerging climate change regime and the sustainable use of biodiversity."

Programme 11
Environment

62. At its 11th meeting, on 12 June 2013, the Committee considered the report of the Secretary-General on consolidated changes to the biennial programme plan as reflected in the proposed programme budget for the biennium 2014-2015 (A/68/75).

63. The Executive Director of the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP) introduced the programme and responded to queries raised during the Committee's consideration of the programme.

Discussion

64. Support and appreciation were expressed for programme 11, Environment. Some delegations noted that the programme is one of the most challenging and of the highest priority. Delegations noted that the work of UNEP in the next biennium must be carried out in the light of the outcomes of the United Nations Conference on Sustainable Development (Rio+20). The same delegations expressed the need for a more balanced approach in terms of the three pillars of sustainable development contained in the programme.

65. The Committee stressed the importance of programme 11 and its implementation in the context of the mandates of UNEP, taking into consideration the outcome of the United Nations Conference on Sustainable Development.

66. The efforts of UNEP to ensure system-wide coherence, the strengthening of regional offices, the support for cooperation, capacity-building and technology transfer initiatives aimed at assisting developing countries were welcomed by some delegations.

67. Some delegations indicated that the United Nations Conference on Sustainable Development was about both sustainable development and the environment, and that it represented a launching pad for a new development model that incorporates social development and environmental protection issues. Poverty eradication as an essential priority of development was referred to as one of the major legacies of the Conference, and the need for having poverty eradication as an overarching theme within the programme was stressed.

68. The view was expressed that integrating the three dimensions of sustainable development, social, environmental and economic, in decision-making was of paramount importance, as well as ensuring that social and environmental objectives guide economic approaches.

69. Some delegations expressed concern about the use of the term "green economy", which was used throughout the biennial programme plan for UNEP. Views were expressed that reference had been made to the term "green economy" in the outcome document of the United Nations Conference on Sustainable Development, "The future we want", in the context of sustainable development and poverty eradication. Accordingly, many delegations queried why "green economy" was not used in that context in the biennial programme plan.

70. Some delegations underscored the connection between the concepts of "green economy" and sustainable development, in that the first should be an instrument for mobilizing countries towards sustainable development, based on the understanding that there is no one-size-fits-all solution. The same delegations affirmed the importance of ensuring that the green economy concept is not interpreted as favouring aspects of commercialization of advanced technology solutions over the pursuit of solutions adapted to the distinct realities of developing countries.

71. Regarding the strengthening of UNEP, it was highlighted that perfecting international environmental governance does not mean prejudging or excluding the need to strengthen the other pillars of sustainable development. On the contrary, it must effectively ensure a coherent treatment of the three pillars.

72. Concern was expressed concerning the chart provided by UNEP during the deliberations in the Committee, which reflected system-wide partnerships for the environment, in particular the coordination and partnerships of UNEP with other United Nations agencies on substantive themes such as "green economy" or "green jobs". Some delegations expressed the view that United Nations agencies should focus on their own mandated activities and not carry out environment-related activities that are under the purview of UNEP.

73. Concern was expressed regarding the continued use by the Secretariat of terms and concepts such as "product life cycle", "ecosystem management", "ecosystem-based adaptation", "societies in transition", "transition to a green economy", "environmental sustainability" and others, regarding which consensus is lacking among Member States. In addition, it was underlined that references to "green economy" must incorporate the complete formulation of the concept, according to section III of the outcome document of the United Nations Conference on Sustainable Development, "The future we want", entitled, "Green economy in the context of sustainable development and poverty eradication".

74. Furthermore, the characterization of "green economy" as a "main pillar underpinning this programme of work" was pointed out as being misleading,

considering it has not been agreed upon at the intergovernmental level, and that it could give rise to confusion regarding the already established three pillars of sustainable development. Clarification was sought regarding the use of the terms "green investments", "green economy policies", "decent green employment" and green postal services. It was pointed out that the term "transition to a green economy" is not coherent with the outcome document of the Conference as it seems to refer to a predetermined form of transition to green economy, while countries need to pursue options that best suit their needs and national circumstances.

75. Views were expressed that few changes had been made to the biennial programme plan for UNEP that had been considered by the Committee in 2012, after the holding of the United Nations Conference on Sustainable Development. Specifically, some delegations indicated that the Committee had received the proposed strategic framework for UNEP for the period 2014-2015 during the fifty-second session, in June 2012, but had decided to delay its consideration until after impact of the Rio Conference was known. However, many delegations expressed the view that some of the proposals now before the Committee did not fully reflect the outcome of the Conference.

76. Under subprogramme 1, a few delegations sought clarification of the phrase "facilitating access to finance".

77. Delegations expressed views on the role of technology and technology transfer on the environment in the context of sustainable development. Also under subprogramme 1, it was noted that indicator of achievement (b) (i) referred to a number of countries implementing new renewable energy and/or energy efficiency initiatives. Delegations questioned whether it might not be possible to also establish an indicator of achievement with regard to the transfer of technologies.

78. Some delegations also expressed concern about the role and mandate of UNEP in disasters and conflicts and the activities it had undertaken with respect to subprogramme 2. It was noted that UNEP should work within its mandate, that is, the environmental dimension of conflict, disaster response and risk reduction, in order to avoid a multiplicity of forums, overlapping with the mandates of other organizations and duplication of efforts in the treatment of the theme. Concern was expressed regarding the establishment of a linkage between the work of UNEP and the broader fields of international peace and security, in order to avoid the "securitization" of the theme. A delegation queried the change in the name of subprogramme 2 to Disasters and conflicts. Clarification was also sought on paragraph 37 of the report on consolidated changes, specifically the reference to UNEP's leadership role "beyond environmental matters".

79. One delegation expressed serious concern about the proposed changes to subprogramme 2, Disasters and conflicts, noting that the changes represented a departure from the previous narrative and stressing that the proposed narrative comprised elements and concepts without intergovernmental mandates. In addition, some of the proposals ignored previous decisions of the General Assembly. The inclusion of elements with a clear political impact that go far beyond the mandate of UNEP was also highlighted as a matter of serious concern by the same delegation, which considered that the subprogramme needed to be reformulated by the Assembly during its sixty-eighth regular session and expressed its intention to propose some amendments to the narrative.

80. Under subprogramme 4, Environmental governance, it was noted by some delegations that there were insufficient references to the principles of the Rio Declaration on Environment and Development as only principle 10 was mentioned. It was further highlighted that Agenda 21 and the Johannesburg Plan of Implementation should provide baselines for many planned activities under the subprogramme.

81. In subprogramme 5, Chemicals and waste, it was noted by some delegations that the subprogramme should not prejudge how the environmentally sound management of chemicals could be included in national plans. It was asserted that the environmentally sound management of chemicals, which can be included into national development plans, should not prescribe how public-private partnerships would eventually be implemented. The need for further discussion of the means of implementation was also underlined.

82. Regarding subprogramme 6, Resource efficiency, some delegations stressed the need to encompass the totality of the themes of the 10-year framework of programmes on sustainable consumption and production, not only the resource efficiency aspect.

83. In view of the expanded programme of work of UNEP, with the proposed establishment of a new subprogramme 7, Environment under review, and the newly mandated activities resulting from the United Nations Conference on Sustainable Development, several delegations raised queries on monitoring and evaluation, and other delegations expressed the view that UNEP should take monitoring and evaluation a step further by focusing on outcomes to determine whether its programmes lead to improvement in the lives of people.

Conclusions and recommendations

84. The Committee stressed the importance of programme 11 and its implementation in the context of the mandates of UNEP and the outcome of the United Nations Conference on Sustainable Development.

85. The Committee noted with concern the continued use by the Secretariat of terms and concepts for which consensus is still lacking among Member States. In that regard, the Committee stressed the need to be consistent with the agreed language, especially in the formulation of the proposed programme plan, when dealing with contentious issues.

86. The Committee stressed that the green economy, in the context of sustainable development and poverty eradication, was a new concept that was agreed upon at the United Nations Conference on Sustainable Development, and that it should therefore be implemented taking the outcome of the Conference into consideration.

87. The Committee welcomed the use of partnerships in the work of UNEP and recommended that the General Assembly request the Secretary-General to ensure that oversight of such partnerships is further increased by UNEP in order to achieve greater transparency and greater accountability to Member States.

88. The Committee recommended that the General Assembly approve the changes to the narrative of programme 11, Environment, as set out in the

report of the Secretary-General (A/68/75) and the relevant section of the proposed programme budget for the biennium 2014-2015 (A/68/6 (Sect. 14)), subject to the following modifications:

Overall orientation

Paragraph 14.2 (A/68/6 (Sect. 14)), paragraph 37 (A/68/75)

Delete the words "with societies in transition".

Paragraph 14.5 (A/68/6 (Sect. 14)), paragraph 40 (A/68/75)

In the first sentence, after the word "technology" add the words ", including through the facilitation of technology development and sharing,".

Paragraph 40 (A/68/75)

In the second sentence, replace the word "safeguards" with the word "considerations,".

Add a new paragraph 14.6 (A/68/6 (Sect. 14)) and paragraph 41 (A/68/75) (renumbering all subsequent paragraphs), to read as follows:

The United Nations Conference on Sustainable Development recognized poverty eradication as the greatest global challenge facing the world today and as an indispensable requirement for sustainable development. Sustainable development and poverty eradication, and green economy policies in that context, are matters of concern for all countries and cannot be dissociated from the commitment of all Member States to freeing humanity from poverty and hunger as a matter of urgency, as stated in the outcome document of the United Nations Conference on Sustainable Development.

Paragraph 14.7 (formerly para. 14.6) (A/68/6 (Sect. 14)), paragraph 42 (formerly para. 41) (A/68/75)

Delete the first sentence of the paragraph and replace it with the following:

A green economy in the context of sustainable development and poverty eradication is one of the important tools for achieving sustainable development; the support that UNEP provides to countries in this regard will constitute an important part of its programme of work.

In the second sentence, delete the phrase "in regard to related opportunities for decent green employment", and revise the sentence to read:

UNEP will, in particular, strengthen its cooperation with the International Labour Organization, in conformity with paragraph 62 of the outcome document of the United Nations Conference on Sustainable Development "The future we want".

Paragraph 14.10 (formerly para. 14.9) (A/68/6 (Sect. 14)), paragraph 45 (formerly para. 44) (A/68/75)

In the first sentence, insert the words "inclusive and transparent intergovernmental" before the phrase "process of developing the sustainable development goals".

Paragraph 14.12 (formerly para. 14.11) (A/68/6 (Sect. 14)), paragraph 47 (formerly para. 46) (A/68/75)

In the first sentence, delete the words "and peacebuilding" and insert the word "and" between the words "response" and "recovery".

Paragraph 14.16 (formerly para. 14.15) (A/68/6 (Sect. 14)), paragraph 51 (formerly para. 50) (A/68/75)

In the last sentence, replace the term "green economy strategies" with the word "strategies".

Paragraph 53 (formerly para. 52) (A/68/75)

In the sixth sentence, delete the words ", through efficiency and decoupling,".

Subprogramme 1
Climate change

Objective of the Organization (A/68/75)

Replace the word "pathways" with the word "strategies".

Expected accomplishments of the Secretariat (A/68/6 (Sect. 14), table 14.15) and (A/68/75, table for subprogramme 1)

In expected accomplishment (a), replace the words "Ecosystem-based and supporting adaptation approaches" with the words "Adaptation approaches, including an ecosystem-based approach,".

In expected accomplishment (b)

Replace the word "pathways" with the word "strategies".

Indicators of achievement (A/68/6 (Sect. 14), table 14.15) and (A/68/75, table for subprogramme 1)

In indicator of achievement (b), add indicator (b) (iii), to read:

"Increased number of implemented programmes/projects by countries on transfer of advanced technologies in the area of renewable energy/or energy efficiency with the assistance of UNEP".

Strategy

Paragraph 54 (formerly para. 53) (A/68/75)

Delete the first part of the second sentence and replace it with the following:

"The subprogramme is aimed at helping countries to build readiness and facilitate access to financing, through, inter alia, the creation of enabling environments, in order to address climate change in the context of sustainable development by:"

In paragraph 54 (d) (formerly para. 53 (d)) (A/68/75)

After the phrase "policies, plans and climate actions in countries" insert the words ", upon their request".

Paragraph 55 (formerly para. 54) (A/68/75)

In the second sentence, delete the words "discussions held and".

In the third sentence, after the words "sound science" insert the words ", in particular by the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change".

In the last sentence, replace the word "pathways" with the word "strategies".

Paragraph 55 (a) (formerly para. 54 (a)) (A/68/75)

In the first sentence, replace the word "pathways" with the word "strategies" and, after the words "UNEP will support countries", insert the words ", in particular developing countries,".

After the word "primarily" insert the words "efforts to incorporate adaptation approaches, including".

In the second sentence, after the words "To achieve this, UNEP will conduct" insert the words ", upon request,".

Paragraph 55 (b) (formerly para. 54 (b)) (A/68/75)

In the first sentence, replace the term "a green economy" with the words "the implementation of green economy strategies".

Insert a new third sentence, to read:

"UNEP will also contribute to climate change mitigation and adaptation by facilitating support of Governments, relevant entities and other entities for the Climate Technology Centre and Network, to be hosted by UNEP."

Paragraph 55 (c) (formerly para. 54 (c)) (A/68/75)

In the fourth sentence, replace the term "the green economy" with the following "green economy policies in the context of sustainable development and poverty eradication and sustainable patterns of consumption and production".

In the last sentence, replace the word "safeguards" with the word "objectives".

Subprogramme 2
Disasters and conflicts

Indicators of achievement (A/68/6 (Sect. 14) and (A/68/75)

In indicator of achievement (a) (ii), replace the words "fragile States and vulnerable regions," with the words "countries emerging from conflict or recovering from natural disasters,".

Strategy

Paragraph 58 (formerly para. 57) (A/68/75)

Delete, the first sentence and replace it with the following:

"Moreover, an internal coordination platform will be established to improve and share knowledge on synergies among work on biodiversity conservation and ecosystem services, adaptation approaches to climate change, including ecosystem-based approaches, and ecosystem-based approaches to disaster risk reduction".

Subprogramme 3
Ecosystem management

Objective of the Organization (A/68/6 (Sect. 14)) and (A/68/75)

Delete the words "provide" and "among countries".

Expected accomplishments of the Secretariat (A/68/6 (Sect. 14), table 14.19) and (A/68/75, table for subprogramme 3)

In expected accomplishment (c), delete the word "wider" and replace the word "seascapes" with the words "coastal zones".

Strategy

Paragraph 62 (a) (formerly para. 61 (a)) (A/68/75)

In the second sentence, after the phrase "feeding a growing global population in a sustainable manner" insert the phrase "while promoting sustainable patterns of consumption and production,".

Paragraph 62 (b) (formerly para. 61 (b)) (A/68/75)

In the first sentence, replace the word "work" with the words "support countries in their efforts".

Subprogramme 4
Environmental governance

Strategy

Paragraph 65 (a) (formerly para. 64 (a)) (A/68/75)

In the first sentence, replace the words "Governing Council/Global Ministerial Environmental Forum" with the words "United Nations

Environment Assembly of UNEP, formerly known as the Governing Council/Global Ministerial Environmental Forum".

Subprogramme 6
Resource efficiency (A/68/6 (Sect. 14) and (A/68/75))

Change the name of the subprogramme to "Resource efficiency and sustainable consumption and production".

Objective of the Organization (A/68/6 (Sect. 14), table 14.25) and (A/68/75, table for subprogramme 6)

Replace the objective with the following: "To promote and assist efforts towards patterns in which goods and services are increasingly produced, processed and consumed in a sustainable way in order to reduce environmental impact and contribute to the achievement of sustainable development and the improvement of human well-being".

Expected accomplishments of the Secretariat (A/68/6 (Sect. 14)) and (A/68/75)

In expected accomplishment (a), delete the words "and a green economy".

Indicators of achievement (A/68/6 (Sect. 14)) and (A/68/75)

Reword indicator of achievement (a) (i) to read: "Increased number of countries and cities that develop and integrate green economy policies, within the context of sustainable development and poverty eradication, and sustainable consumption and production approaches and tools, as a result of UNEP assistance".

Paragraph 68 (a) (formerly para. 67 (a)) (A/68/75)

In the first sentence, after the acronym "UNEP" insert the words ", upon request,".

Replace the words "in developing policies that support a transition to a green economy" with the words "in developing green economy policies and practices".

Paragraph 70 (formerly para. 69) (A/68/75)

In the first sentence, after the words "poverty eradication" insert the words ", as well as joint efforts to promote sustainable patterns of consumption and production".

Programme 12
Human settlements

89. At its 15th meeting, on 14 June 2013, the Committee considered the report of the Secretary-General on consolidated changes to the biennial programme plan as reflected in the proposed programme budget for the biennium 2014-2015 (A/68/75).

90. The Executive Director of the United Nations Human Settlements Programme (UN-Habitat) introduced the programme and responded to queries raised during the Committee's consideration of the programme.

Discussion

91. Support was expressed for programme 12, Human settlements, of the biennial programme plan and priorities for the period 2014-2015 (A/67/6/Rev.1) and for the work of UN-Habitat. Delegations expressed their appreciation for the incorporation of the recommendations of the Committee, clearly elaborating the revisions, and reflecting, in the biennial programme plan, the six-year strategic plan 2014-2019 as approved by the Governing Council of UN-Habitat. Some delegations noted the incorporation of experiences, lessons learned and best practices into the biennial programme plan for the period 2014-2015.

92. The view was expressed that the cooperation and collaboration of UN-Habitat with other United Nations organizations in executing its programme of work was important. Clarification was sought regarding the collaboration of UN-Habitat with partners outside the United Nations system and on how synergies were created between UN-Habitat and other United Nations structures as a result of such collaboration.

93. Clarification was sought on the mainstreaming of cross-cutting issues, such as youth, human rights, partnerships and climate change throughout the seven subprogrammes, as indicated in paragraph 81 of the report.

94. Questions were raised about the inclusion of human rights as a cross-cutting issue in the programme. In that context, clarification was sought on the nature and the scope of the implementation of actions related to human rights. The opinion was expressed that UN-Habitat does not have any mandate in the field of human rights. Information was also requested on cooperation between UN-Habitat and other United Nations entities, such as the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights (OHCHR) and the United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime (UNODC).

95. Other delegations expressed the view that they did not share the concern over the inclusion of human rights as a cross-cutting issue.

96. In addition, delegations sought clarification on the use of the term "planned results" in paragraph 78 of the report and asked whether this was a new category being introduced as opposed to the agreed terminology of "expected accomplishments". Explanation was also sought on the "Project Advisory Group" and "in-house peer review mechanism" discussed in paragraph 83 of the report, in particular, who are the members of the Group, what is the purpose of the entity and who constituted a "peer".

97. Some delegations sought clarification on the results-based budgeting methodology in general, and expressed their views on the development of better indicators of achievement.

98. A query was made on indicator of achievement (b) under subprogramme 1, Urban legislation, land and governance, on the approach to the implementation of programmes for vulnerable groups, including women, youth, indigenous people and minorities. Under the same subprogramme, a delegation expressed views on the formulation of the indicator of achievement (c) (i), in which the phrase "implementing the guidelines on decentralization" had been replaced with "adopted the guidelines on decentralization".

99. Under subprogramme 5, Housing and slum upgrading, clarification was sought on the use of the term "supranational authorities" in indicator of achievement (a) (i), and on the meaning of the expression "unlawful forced evictions" in indicator of achievement (a) (ii).

100. Some delegations sought clarification as to whether UN-Habitat had established criteria to identify projects under technical cooperation for implementation in a particular country. The view was expressed on the incorporation of the post-2015 development agenda into the programme of work of UN-Habitat and delivery of its programme in the Africa region, especially in the least developed countries.

101. The view was expressed with regard to the importance of providing printed publications in lieu of electronic distribution in countries that have limited technology.

Conclusions and recommendations

102. **The Committee emphasized the need for UN-Habitat to develop synergies with other United Nations entities in the implementation of the Habitat Agenda.**

103. **The Committee recommended that the General Assembly approve the changes to the narrative of programme 12, Human settlements, as set out in the report of the Secretary-General (A/68/75), subject to the following modifications:**

Delete the reference to "planned results" throughout the document.

Paragraph 83

In the second sentence, after the word "documents", add the phrase "including those to be implemented in countries which are not beneficiaries of the United Nations operational activities for development."

In the last sentence, delete the phrase "and that indicators are put in place to monitor human rights progress."

Subprogramme 1

In indicator of achievement (a), at the end of the phrase, add the words "with the technical support of UN-Habitat".

Subprogramme 3

In expected accomplishment (b), replace the word "targeted" with the word "partner".

Subprogramme 4

In expected accomplishment (a), after the words "implemented by", add the word "partner".

Reformulate indicator of achievement (a) as follows:

"Increased number of partner local, regional and national authorities implementing policies and the International Guidelines on Decentralization and Access to Basic Services for All".

Subprogramme 5

Reformulate indicator of achievement (a) (i) as follows:

"Number of local, regional and national authorities, as well as regional and international forums, organizations and partners, that have joined the Global Housing Strategy."

Programme 15
Economic and social development in Africa

104. At its 17th meeting, on 17 June 2013, the Committee considered the report of the Secretary-General on consolidated changes to the biennial programme plan as reflected in the proposed programme budget for the biennium 2014-2015 (A/68/75).

105. The Executive Secretary of the Economic Commission for Africa (ECA) introduced the programme and responded to queries raised during the Committee's consideration of the programme.

Discussion

106. Support and appreciation were expressed for programme 15, Economic and social development in Africa, contained in the report on consolidated changes to the biennial programme plan as reflected in the proposed programme budget for the biennium 2014-2015 (A/68/75). Views were expressed that the changes proposed adequately reflected the framework overwhelmingly endorsed at the forty-sixth session of ECA, held in Abidjan, Côte d'Ivoire, on 25 and 26 March 2013, and that ECA was embarking on an ambitious and challenging agenda which required the full support of Member States. Member States expressed their support for the restructuring of ECA to make it more effective. The structure was well organized. It was part of Africa's renaissance and represented what the United Nations Conference on Sustainable Development wished to see. The context of the nine subprogrammes fully reflected the concerns of the African Union.

107. Views were expressed regarding infrastructure, trade and the movement of goods between landlocked countries and ports. One example of a major infrastructure project in Africa was the East African Corridor. Member States queried ECA as to any ongoing infrastructure development projects to further facilitate trade and development. ECA was also queried about the extent of help in trade and services provided to Member States within the context of ECA support to regional economic communities.

108. Delegations expressed the need for the Commission to continue to provide support for the regional integration programmes in Africa being undertaken by the regional economic communities.

109. Delegations also appreciated that, despite the progress made in the areas of trade in goods and services, it had been noted that many challenges to the work in trade facilitation remained, especially owing to the lack of reliable hard infrastructure in the region.

110. Some delegations stressed the need for the Commission and other partners, such as the African Development Bank and the World Bank, to continue to provide support in order to complement the efforts of regional economic communities in building infrastructure, in particular the railroad and highway connectivities, as a

necessary element for trade facilitation and linkage to other key sectors of the economies, such as agriculture.

111. Views were also expressed as to whether ECA was able to capture the impact of its development projects and whether the indicators of achievement appropriately measured how the subprogrammes were accomplishing their objectives. For example, subprogramme 6, Gender and women in development, had indicators that seemed to measure progress and knowledge of women's issues instead of focusing on the objective of promoting gender equality and women's empowerment.

112. Concern was expressed about the provision by ECA of support to least developed countries, as there was no reference in the biennial programme plan to the Fourth United Nations Conference on the Least Developed Countries, held in Istanbul, Turkey. Member States expressed views about the possibility of strengthening ECA efforts and support to least developed countries, and whether initiatives could be further exploited in that regard. The view was also expressed that ECA should provide equal support to both least developed countries and landlocked developing countries.

113. It was observed that the ECA programme of work should seek to eradicate poverty instead of reducing poverty. Member States queried ECA as to why it had not gone further to include strategies for eliminating poverty altogether in the programme of work.

114. It was also observed that one of the Commission's goals as part of its strategy was to graduate countries to middle-income status. Some delegations sought clarification about the challenges and pitfalls of bringing countries from low- to middle-income status.

115. Member States expressed the view that multiple studies had been carried out under subprogramme 9, Social development policy, and questioned ECA about the need for additional research and studies. The view was expressed that ECA should use existing studies for the implementation of its programme of work.

116. The view was also expressed that ECA was lacking focus on energy issues and that more attention should be given to that area.

117. Member States expressed concern about the changes to the biennial programme plan owing to the restructuring of ECA and that at least a couple paragraphs had not been included in the overall orientation or in the strategies of each subprogramme to explain the changes.

118. It was observed that the report referred to consultations on a post-2015 development agenda as one of the reasons for the restructuring of the Commission. Member States observed that the consultations were ongoing and questioned how ECA could incorporate the results of the consultations into its programme of work.

119. Member States expressed their views on the importance of accurate statistical data that would enable ECA to plan and implement its programme of work.

120. Some delegations queried ECA on subprogramme 6, Gender and women in development, and its interaction with the United Nations Entity for Gender Equality and the Empowerment of Women (UN-Women), which was not mentioned in the biennial programme plan. Member States also sought clarification about the reference to providing support for gender-sensitive strategies for building and

sustaining Africa's digital economy in the context of subprogramme 3, Innovations, technologies and management of Africa's natural resources.

Conclusions and recommendations

121. **The Committee recommended that the General Assembly approve the changes to the narrative of programme 15, Economic and social development in Africa, as set out in the report of the Secretary-General (A/68/75).**

Programme 16
Economic and social development in Asia and the Pacific

122. At its 13th meeting, on 13 June 2013, the Committee considered the report of the Secretary-General on consolidated changes to the biennial programme plan as reflected in the proposed programme budget for the biennium 2014-2015 (A/68/75).

123. Representatives of the Secretary-General introduced the consolidated report and responded to queries raised during its consideration by the Committee.

Discussion

124. Appreciation and support were expressed for programme 16, Economic and social development in Asia and the Pacific, of the biennial programme plan for the period 2014-2015 (A/67/6/Rev.1) and for the work of the Economic and Social Commission for Asia and the Pacific (ESCAP) in the region, which is home to two thirds of the world's population.

125. A view was expressed that activities should focus on the practical needs of countries concerned, in particular the least developed countries, including infrastructure financing, disaster risk reduction, poverty eradication, social security, ageing, health and security. In the context of the overall work of ESCAP on global issues in the region, such as good governance, economic cooperation, climate change and food security, there was a need to carry out forward-looking analysis in those areas and to assist Member States so that efforts towards the achievement of the Millennium Development Goals would be country-led.

126. Information was sought on the outcome of the final review of the Commission's conference structure, including its subsidiary structure, which was undertaken at the Commission's sixty-ninth session.

127. Clarification was sought as to what specific changes had been made to the biennial programme plan for the period 2014-2015, taking into account the decisions emanating from General Assembly resolution 66/288, by which the Assembly endorsed the outcome document of the United Nations Conference on Sustainable Development, entitled "The future we want". The question was also raised as to whether all of the regional commissions had modified their respective biennial programme plans.

128. One delegation emphasized the importance of ensuring that the activities of ESCAP would be in conformity with intergovernmental mandates, and in this regard highlighted activities with regard to "Delivering as one", a concept that was still under consideration by Member States.

129. Some delegations expressed their concern over the Secretariat's use of terms that do not have intergovernmental mandate under the section "other information",

and emphasized that the narrative in the programme budget should be based on the approved narrative in the strategic framework. Those delegations considered that the Fifth Committee of the General Assembly should address this matter within the framework of its consideration of the proposed programme budget for 2014-2015.

130. Some delegations sought clarification on various aspects of the methodology of the results-based logical framework of ESCAP, including details on changes in indicators of achievement and an explanation of the linkages between the programme budget and the plan of action.

131. One delegation sought clarification regarding efforts to improve geographical representation and regarding available resources, both assessed and extrabudgetary, which was not normally predictable. With regard to available resources, clarification was sought as to whether the requirements for the mandates to be implemented by ESCAP or driven by budgetary constraints had been reflected therein. Another delegation noted that budgetary issues were not within the purview of the Committee.

132. A delegation expressed the view that in future biennial programme plans, under component 3 of subprogramme 8, Subregional activities for development, a new expected accomplishment and indicator of achievement should be included as follows: expected accomplishments: (c) Strengthened intraregional cooperation and integration for the promotion of inclusive and sustainable development, including through South-South cooperation; indicators of achievement: (c) Increase in the number of joint intraregional initiatives, programmes and projects between North and Central Asia with or through the ESCAP subregional office for North and Central Asia.

Conclusions and recommendations

133. **The Committee recommended that the General Assembly approve the changes to the narrative of programme 16, Economic and social development in Asia and the Pacific, as set out in the report of the Secretary-General (A/68/75).**

B. Evaluation

1. Strengthening the role of evaluation and the application of evaluation findings on programme design, delivery and policy directives

134. At its 3rd meeting on 4 June 2013, the Committee considered the report of the Office of Internal Oversight Services (OIOS) on strengthening the role of evaluation and the application of evaluation findings on programme design, delivery and policy directives (A/68/70).

135. The Under-Secretary-General for Internal Oversight Services introduced the report and responded to questions raised during the Committee's consideration of the report.

Discussion

136. Delegations expressed appreciation for the quality of the report of OIOS on strengthening the role of evaluation and the application of evaluation findings on programme design, delivery and policy directives. They recalled the

recommendations adopted by the Committee, emphasizing that evaluation was a key function not only for the adoption of budgetary decisions, but also for the formulation of policy directives. They also stressed the importance of the greater impact that evaluation should have on the medium- and long-term strategic planning of the United Nations system.

137. It was noted by some delegations, as the Committee had done during its fifty-first session, that the effectiveness of evaluation depended on, among other factors, the quality of management indicators. For that purpose, the need to improve the methodology for conducting assessments and to ensure regular follow-up on the progress achieved was increasingly clear. The recommendation on the need to apply a more systematic approach to evaluating activities by OIOS in terms of the better exploitation of complementarities and synergies among all relevant United Nations departments, adopted by the Committee during the fifty-first session, was reaffirmed.

138. The Committee noted the uneven and not systematic application of the evaluation function throughout the Secretariat and that the level of skills and competencies of the staff in different departments was generally inadequate, owing inter alia, to insufficient training. The Committee further reaffirmed that the evaluation function, in particular self-evaluation, was an essential managerial tool and that it was the responsibility of managers at the senior level to achieve the expected results and to ensure that relevant staff were adequately competent.

139. The Committee also noted with concern that the lack of a proper evaluation function could hamper the implementation of mandates, in particular by affecting the work planning exercise, which was necessary in order to carry out the mandates and to facilitate the adoption of strategic planning decisions.

140. A number of delegations raised serious concerns regarding the inadequacy of and gaps within the evaluation function. Several delegations noted that evaluation was not being used as a management tool and that the activities of the Organization should be subject to integrated management, which incorporated planning, programming, budgeting, monitoring, inspection and evaluation. A number of delegations recognized the importance of evaluation for providing timely and high-quality information that could contribute to improved planning, transparency and accountability. Moreover, they noted that evaluation was an important function for ascertaining whether programmes were achieving their goals and for capturing lessons learned.

141. Regarding financial and human resources for evaluation, it was noted by several delegations that that issue was not within the mandate of the Committee and should be dealt with in another forum. Nevertheless, questions were raised as to the parameters for sufficient evaluation resources. In addition, the comment was made that, despite the provision of significant resources and the increased emphasis placed on evaluation in recent years, clear benefits were not being seen. The view was also expressed that, as OIOS had indicated, "a lack of management support for and buy-in to evaluation" was a major concern, and it seemed clear that, until that issue was resolved, the provision of additional resources would be unlikely to yield the results that Member States might expect.

142. Regarding the lack of an evaluation culture within the Secretariat, in particular, a number of delegations indicated that that state of affairs was

discouraging and delegations were concerned that evaluation was considered a burden more than a useful tool. Concern was also expressed by some delegations that the Committee was seen as a constraint and a hindrance. That view was not shared by the delegations; in fact, delegations saw the Committee as performing an important role in ensuring that the Secretariat was correctly translating mandates into programme delivery.

143. A number of delegations generally concurred that the Committee must make strong recommendations addressing the critical evaluation gaps identified in the OIOS report, for example the possibility of including the use of evaluation by programmes as an additional indicator in the compact of the Secretary-General with his senior managers and of holding managers responsible in that regard.

144. As to evaluation competencies, it was noted by some delegations that resources were not the only obstacle to effective evaluation; as stated in the report, the weakness of competencies in the field of evaluation was also an obstacle. The point was made that training alone might not close the gap identified with regard to uneven evaluation competencies.

145. Delegations also raised several questions regarding the methodology for the OIOS report, including whether OIOS participated in interviews with Secretariat programmes and the reasons why donor evaluations had been excluded from the assessment and an external expert had been engaged to assess the quality of Secretariat evaluation reports. A few delegations also questioned the ways in which gender and human rights could be integrated into all evaluations in all programmes. At the same time, several delegations sought further clarification from OIOS on the differences between evaluation conducted by OIOS and evaluation conducted by the programmes themselves, and the apparent confusion within the Secretariat between monitoring and evaluation.

Conclusions and recommendations

146. **The Committee emphasized that some progress had been achieved by OIOS in the implementation of the Committee's recommendations made during its fifty-first session on ensuring that evaluation reports focus on programme impact and results achieved, improving the methodology for conducting assessments, including regular follow-up on the progress made, applying a more systematic approach to evaluation activities, including exploitation of complementarities and synergies of all activities, and strengthening coordination among all relevant departments.**

147. **The Committee noted with satisfaction the evaluation results; in particular where the reports received a "good" or "excellent" quality rating when analysed in terms of their contents, including in five programmes in the area of the development of Africa.**

148. **The Committee expressed its concern that, despite OIOS actions and initiatives, which had led to a degree of progress during the biennium, the goal of ensuring the application of evaluation findings on programme design, delivery and policy directives in the Organization was far from being reached, and that the overall capacity for evaluation remained inadequate for several reasons, including:**

(a) The lack of a robust and comprehensive evaluation culture and policies in the Secretariat;

(b) The lack of management support, leadership, accountability and buy-in;

(c) Gaps in the skills and competencies of staff, and insufficient training;

(d) The lack of dedicated personnel for evaluation;

(e) The lack of clear identification of resources related to evaluation;

(f) Shortfalls in the quality of management indicators;

(g) The existence of critical gaps in the evaluation functions.

149. The Committee noted with concern that the overall quality rating of evaluation reports in 2010-2011 was below average.

150. The Committee noted that the effectiveness of evaluation depended on, among other factors, the quality of management indicators.

151. The Committee emphasized that evaluation was a key function for the adoption of budgetary decisions, since it not only helped to improve programme design and execution, as well as the formulation of policy directives, but also contributed to transparency, the effective implementation of intergovernmental mandates and the maximization of the use of resources. At the same time, it allowed Member States to follow up on programme outcomes in a systematic way.

152. The Committee also emphasized that the evaluation function, in particular self-evaluation, was an essential managerial tool, and that it was the responsibility of senior managers to achieve the expected results.

153. The Committee recommended that the General Assembly request the Secretary-General to take further, concrete measures to develop capacity for evaluation within the Secretariat programmes, with support provided by OIOS and external oversight bodies in terms of guidance and methodological advice.

154. The Committee recommended that the General Assembly request the Secretary-General to continue to make better use of in-house expertise, including, where possible, expertise available within OIOS, to carry out evaluations in the different entities of the Secretariat, taking advantage of the experience acquired by the internal and external oversight bodies, and to ensure that all efforts are made to avoid duplication and/or overlapping of evaluation functions in the Secretariat.

155. The Committee recommended that the General Assembly request the Secretary-General to ensure that senior managers' compacts present adequate programme objectives and performance measures in order to fulfil given mandates in accordance with relevant rules and regulations, and that the evaluation function receives due consideration in the performance appraisal of the senior managers.

156. The Committee recommended that the General Assembly request the Secretary-General to take concrete measures at the appropriate levels to ensure

that the existing significant gaps in evaluation coverage and the lack of evaluative evidence on performance are addressed.

157. **The Committee recommended that the General Assembly request the Secretary-General to entrust OIOS with harmonizing, to the extent possible, a format for its evaluation reports, including findings, conclusions and recommendations.**

158. **The Committee selected the following programme evaluations for consideration at its fifty-fifth session in 2015: Economic and social development in Asia and the Pacific; Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees; United Nations Human Settlements Programme; Economic Commission for Latin America and the Caribbean; United Nations Conference on Trade and Development; International Trade Centre; and United Nations Entity for Gender Equality and the Empowerment of Women (UN-Women); as well as the thematic evaluation of monitoring and evaluation of the Millennium Development Goals: lessons learned.**

2. Programme evaluation of the United Nations Environment Programme

159. At its 4th meeting, on 4 June 2013, the Committee considered the report of OIOS on the programme evaluation of UNEP (E/AC.51/2013/2).

160. The Under-Secretary-General for Internal Oversight Services introduced the report and responded to questions raised during the Committee's consideration of the report.

Discussion

161. Many delegations noted with appreciation the high quality of the report, which they found useful and interesting. They generally agreed with its results and conclusions and supported its recommendations. In the view of delegations, the report showed how UNEP had faced challenges in the environmental area and had fulfilled its mandate effectively, in particular with regard to monitoring the state of the world's environment and guiding the transition to the green economy, as well as with its strong science base. A number of delegations further expressed agreement with statements in the OIOS report that called for more attention to be paid to capacity-building and the strengthening of the UNEP regional offices, in addition to enhancing its presence at the national level.

162. Delegations also raised concerns about overlapping and unclear roles and inadequate coordination between UNEP and other United Nations entities within the environmental field, seeking further clarification on the reasons for and solutions to that issue. They called for increased cooperation with other United Nations entities, such as the United Nations Industrial Development Organization in the area of sustainable energy and the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization in the area of science. A number of delegations emphasized that there was a need for more synergies between environmental conventions served by UNEP and for lower administrative costs to UNEP partners. A query was raised as to why no reference had been made in the report to poverty eradication, which was an important goal of sustainable development.

163. Several delegations discussed the recent United Nations Conference on Sustainable Development, expressing their general support for its conclusions with

regard to strengthening UNEP. The view was also expressed, however, that strengthening UNEP also required increased accountability.

164. Delegations sought clarification on some of the language used in the report, including "partnerships", "green economy" and "global green new deal", especially because they were concepts that had not yet been agreed upon by Member States. Further clarification was sought as to the reference made by OIOS in its report to "a lack of shared understanding regarding the UNEP regional and global work programmes and activities". Explanation was also sought regarding the use of federated resource mobilization policies. Furthermore, one delegation expressed concern regarding the prioritization by UNEP of its activities given its high level of donor funding.

165. A few delegations also commented on the structure and number of posts being funded from the programme budget, saying that they would have expected some review and more action-oriented comments regarding the earmarking of resources received by UNEP. As to resources, a number of delegations said that resource discussions were not the purview of the Committee and would be addressed in another forum. Clarification was sought as to what was meant by developing "stronger programme planning and management processes", in addition to any lessons learned and comparative advantages.

166. With regard to the methodology of the OIOS report, delegations asked about the low response rate (33 per cent) to the survey of the States members of the UNEP Governing Council, how the survey had been conducted and OIOS verification of the data reported.

Conclusions and recommendations

167. The Committee recommended that the General Assembly should approve all the recommendations contained in the report of OIOS, on the evaluation of UNEP (E/AC.51/2013/2).

168. With regard to recommendation 1, the Committee also recommended that the General Assembly should request the Secretary-General to further increase transparency and accountability to Member States.

169. The Committee recognized that UNEP had achieved positive results in addressing a broad range of environmental issues, had been a critical force in the development of global environmental norms and standards and had achieved positive results in building the capacity of national Governments.

170. The Committee noted the efforts under way to strengthen UNEP and the role of the organization in promoting the coherent implementation of the environmental dimension of sustainable development within the United Nations system.

171. In that regard, the Committee stressed the importance of promoting a balanced integration of the economic, social and environmental dimensions of sustainable development, in addition to coordination within the United Nations system.

172. The Committee welcomed the efforts of UNEP to strengthen capacity-building support services in line with the needs and priorities of Member States.

3. Evaluation of the Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs

173. At its fourth and fifth meetings, on 4 and 5 June 2013, the Committee considered the report of OIOS on the evaluation of the Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs (E/AC.51/2013/3).

174. The Under-Secretary-General for Internal Oversight Services introduced the report and representatives of OIOS and the Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs responded to questions raised during the Committee's consideration of the report.

Discussion

175. Delegations expressed appreciation for the OIOS report, noting its comprehensive nature and usefulness. A specific reference was made to the user-friendliness of the recommendations format utilized in the report.

176. Several delegations expressed their wish to utilize evaluation data to assess the efficiency and effectiveness of the important work undertaken by the Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs. Furthermore, many delegations underscored the important work carried out by the Office with regard to the coordination of humanitarian responses; fundraising and managing of humanitarian response funds; and the provision of support, in particular for the implementation of the transformative agenda of the Inter-Agency Standing Committee. At the same time, a few delegations sought clarification as to who had endorsed the transformative agenda.

177. As to the assessment of the efficiency and effectiveness of the Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs, clarification was sought by several delegations regarding the availability of performance data. Specifically, a number of delegations questioned why OIOS had not included a recommendation for a database to be developed if, as reflected in the OIOS report, "no single data source allows for quantification of the degree to which the international humanitarian system has improved efficiency, effectiveness or the final impact upon those affected by natural and man-made disasters".

178. Many delegations commented on the need to strengthen coordination between Inter-Agency Standing Committee partners in order to provide better humanitarian assistance. Harmonization in the United Nations system was also referred to by some delegations. A few delegations noted that a key area of the work of the Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs concerned close cooperation with host Governments based on humanitarian principles. Furthermore, queries were raised as to how coordination could be improved, particularly in the light of the comment in the OIOS report that "a number of stakeholders point to coordination within the United Nations as being complicated by systemic governance and accountability arrangements, at times being fragmented among entities with separate governing bodies and overlapping mandates that have differing approaches to the exercise of centralized or delegated authority".

179. A few delegations commented on the importance of the concept of resilience in humanitarian assistance. Moreover, they sought clarification on the role of the Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs in resilience work and raised questions as to why the OIOS report did not include a recommendation on resilience.

180. Delegations noted the increasing need to provide humanitarian support in the context of disasters. In this regard, further clarification was requested regarding why there had been a decline in the percentage of funding for humanitarian assistance needs in official development assistance.

181. A few delegations also sought clarification regarding the extent to which the OIOS report identified a lack of clarity about the role of the regional offices of the Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs and about what that Office and Member States should do to improve clarity. In addition, clarification was sought as to why, at the national level, the Humanitarian Coordinator was not a staff member of the Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs. Moreover, clarification was sought about the surge mechanisms and about the reasons why the Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs did not have aggregate data on the timeliness of regional office surge deployment.

Conclusions and recommendations

182. **The Committee recommended that the General Assembly take note of the report of OIOS on the evaluation of the Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs (E/AC.51/2013/3).**

4. Evaluation of the United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime

183. At its 7th meeting, on 6 June 2013, the Committee considered the report of OIOS on the evaluation of UNODC (E/AC.51/2013/4).

184. The Under-Secretary-General for Internal Oversight Services introduced the report and responded to questions raised during the Committee's consideration of the report.

Discussion

185. Delegations expressed appreciation for the relevance of the report and stated that the results would be useful in learning about the important work being done by UNODC in helping countries respond to drug- and crime-related threats. In particular, they underscored the importance of the Office's technical assistance work in strengthening the capacity of Member States to set norms and adopt policies.

186. Some delegations expressed satisfaction with the Office's research and analysis work, in particular its annual *World Drug Report* and its surveys on illicit crop cultivation, as important sources to inform their decision-making processes. Others remarked that UNODC could improve the dissemination of its work and consider having a coherent communications strategy to enhance the effectiveness of its research and analysis work.

187. Concerns were expressed about the ability of UNODC to monitor results in the field, and to establish a fully operational integrated programming approach that responds to national priorities. Questions were also raised regarding the role that OIOS played in assisting UNODC to strengthen its evaluation capacity.

188. Delegations also expressed concern about the level of regular budget resources assigned to UNODC. In this regard, they recalled General Assembly resolution 67/193, in which the Assembly had expressed its concern regarding the overall financial situation of UNODC, emphasized the need to improve the cost-effective

utilization of resources by the Office and requested the Secretary-General to submit proposals in his proposed programme budget for the biennium 2014-2015 to ensure that the Office has sufficient resources to carry out its mandates.

189. The same delegations stressed the need for the Secretary-General to strictly implement the above-mentioned resolution while presenting his budgetary submission for the biennium 2014-2015.

190. Other delegations remarked that budget matters were not within the purview of the Committee.

191. Some delegations asked questions about the continued challenge facing the Office in meeting the needs and priorities of the beneficiary countries within the framework of increased earmarking of extrabudgetary contributions. One delegation expressed the view that UNODC could not be expected to deliver results given the high level of strict earmarking.

192. Concern was also expressed over the high level of earmarked contributions provided to the Office, and its negative impact on the implementation of its programme.

193. Concern was raised by several delegations regarding the OIOS recommendation on fundraising and earmarking (recommendation 4). Several delegations strongly supported the recommendation on setting a goal to reduce the earmarking of extrabudgetary contributions so as to enable UNODC to respond more effectively to the needs and priorities of Member States. Other delegations were equally strongly against the recommendation, noting that it would not increase the availability of extrabudgetary resources.

194. A number of delegations expressed concern over the growing number of mandates given to UNODC and about the Office's arrangements for collaboration with other entities in order to respond to those mandates in a more effective manner.

195. Questions were raised by delegations on the regional approach to UNODC operations and the use of the logframe approach for the evaluation exercise, and they expressed their support for an integrated programme approach to UNODC operations.

196. Several delegations expressed full support for the results and conclusions of the report and to the recommendations contained therein.

Conclusions and recommendations

197. **The Committee noted the global nature of challenges confronting UNODC and recognized the effectiveness and the impact of the activities of the Office in the field, while acknowledging the specificities of its current structure.**

198. **The Committee emphasized, in particular, the value of the Office's provision of technical expertise in supporting the efforts of Member States, upon their request, in ratifying international instruments, as well as its role in mobilizing financial and technical assistance to meet the needs of Member States in their fight against drugs and crime.**

199. **The Committee further noted the value of UNODC research and analysis, and its publications, and considered that the findings of the evaluation report underlined the important contribution of the Office to capacity-building at both the regional and national levels.**

200. The Committee also noted the need for a wider operational knowledge management strategy that could further leverage the Office's research and analysis work for potential impact.

201. The Committee appreciated the report of OIOS on the evaluation of UNODC (E/AC.51/2013/4) and took note of the recommendations contained therein.

202. Upon enquiry, the Committee was informed that the reference to counterfeiting in table 2 of the OIOS report referred to the illicit trafficking of property.

203. The Committee stressed the need for UNODC to improve synergies with other United Nations entities, with the aim of increasing efficiency in programme delivery while avoiding duplication and overlapping.

204. While noting the information provided in the programme impact pathway for UNODC, the Committee emphasized that expected accomplishments and, where possible, indicators of achievement were included to measure achievements in the implementation of United Nations programmes by the Secretariat and not those of individual Member States.

5. Evaluation of the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees

205. At its seventh and ninth meetings, on 6 and 11 June 2013, the Committee had before it the report of OIOS on the evaluation of the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR) (E/AC.51/2013/5).

206. The Under-Secretary-General for Internal Oversight Services introduced the report and representatives of OIOS and UNHCR responded to questions raised by the Committee on procedural issues.

Discussion

207. Many delegations raised procedural questions regarding the submission of a report that was not consistent with the recommendation contained in paragraph 66 of the previous report of the Committee (A/66/16), which had been endorsed by the General Assembly in its resolution 66/8. Delegations therefore questioned whether the Committee should consider the report, regardless of whether it was interesting or useful.

208. Clarification was sought regarding why the mandated report had not been produced. Following the responses provided by the Secretariat and, notably, the interpretation as to the authority for such a programme evaluation of UNHCR, a number of delegations expressed the view that there needed to be coordination between OIOS and UNHCR so that the work of the Committee was not affected. Views were expressed, in particular, that the quantum of resources, whether from the programme budget or from extrabudgetary sources, could not be the basis on which the programme evaluation was or was not to be carried out.

209. The view was expressed that the non-submission of the requested report had to be seen in the context of the issues raised in another report on evaluation currently before the Committee (A/68/70), which highlighted the "lack of an evaluation culture" in the Organization. The view was also expressed that no entity of the United Nations fell outside the need to improve.

210. Some delegations saw the need to reiterate the existing mandate for the report to be submitted, while other delegations expressed the view that that was not necessary, as the existing mandate remained valid and must be complied with.

211. The Chairman summarized the procedural concerns raised by delegations during the discussion regarding the deviation of the contents of the report from what had been sought by the General Assembly and elaborated on a number of options as a way forward. Moreover, given the delicate situation as well as having recognized that delegations needed time to thoroughly review and discuss, among themselves, the way forward, the Chairman indicated he would provide time for delegations to formulate appropriate conclusions and recommendations to the Assembly.

212. A view was expressed regarding the evaluation capacity at UNHCR, in particular, that evaluations should be conducted by qualified staff and should show value for money. A view was also expressed generally accepting the recommendations contained in the report.

Conclusions and recommendations

213. **The Committee was deeply concerned that the required programme evaluation report on UNHCR, as mandated by the General Assembly in its resolution 66/8, had not been submitted to the Committee.**

214. **The Committee was also concerned about the lack of UNHCR cooperation with OIOS. Equally, the Committee expressed its dissatisfaction with the fact that, in the absence of the ability to prepare the mandated report, OIOS had not sought further guidance on that problem and instead had prepared and submitted to the Committee an alternative report for which it had no specific mandate.**

215. **The Committee was further concerned that, despite the provisions on inspection and evaluation contained in General Assembly resolution 48/218 B, it was only upon the discussion of the issue in the Committee that UNHCR had agreed to cooperate with OIOS for a programme evaluation.**

216. **The Committee strongly recommended that the General Assembly request the Secretary-General to entrust OIOS with conducting, as soon as possible, the required programme evaluation, pursuant to the above-mentioned resolution, and to submit the report to the Committee for Programme and Coordination during its fifty-fifth session in 2015. The report entitled "Review of the evaluation capacity of the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees" (E/AC.51/2013/5) would be considered in conjunction with the above report.**

Chapter III
Coordination questions

A. Annual overview report of the United Nations System Chief Executives Board for Coordination for 2012

217. At its 8th meeting, on 6 June 2013, the Committee for Programme and Coordination considered the annual overview report of CEB for 2012 (E/2013/60).

218. The Director of CEB introduced the report and responded to questions raised during the Committee's consideration of it.

Discussion

219. The annual overview report of CEB for 2012 was welcomed, and appreciation was expressed for the Board's important work to promote coherence and coordination among the entities of the United Nations system. In particular, efforts to ensure the responsiveness of United Nations system activities to national priorities were welcomed, and Committee members noted that the report now included an annex providing a summary of the actions taken by CEB in response to conclusions and recommendations from the previous year. In this regard, a number of delegations sought clarification with regard to the contents of the report, in particular the fact that it did not provide sufficient information in response to the Committee's previous conclusions and recommendations. A delegation expressed the view that the annexation to the report of a summary of the status of implementation of those conclusions and recommendations was merely a formality. In that context, it highlighted various examples demonstrating deviation from legislative mandates on the part of various Secretariat entities, including CEB. The need to respect the respective and distinct roles of the principal United Nations organs, in accordance with the Charter, was also highlighted by that delegation. In addition, a number of delegations expressed regret that the Secretary-General continued to ignore several of the Committee's conclusions and recommendations, as reflected in the report.

220. Serious concern was expressed by one delegation at the lack of compliance on the part of the Secretariat with a number of United Nations resolutions, as reflected during the consideration of various documents by the Committee during its current session. The narrative of programme 11, Environment, demonstrated this situation, in the opinion of the delegation.

221. Delegations recognized and welcomed efforts to foster increased dialogue between Member States and CEB, especially in the area of the harmonization of business practices. Clarification was sought as to whether this was limited to formal meetings, such as those of the Committee, the Economic and Social Council and the General Assembly, or whether it also included informal meetings. The importance of utilizing both modalities was stressed.

222. Some delegations emphasized the importance of ensuring that the activities of CEB were in conformity with intergovernmental mandates, and highlighted activities regarding the inter-agency coordination mechanism on oceans and coastal issues (UN-Oceans) and "Delivering as one", which, they noted, were still under consideration by Member States. Delegations also enquired about the mandate to

mainstream the rule of law into the work of the United Nations, noting specifically the comment in the report that "the Secretary-General decided to mainstream the rule of law in the work of the United Nations" and that CEB had agreed to support the Secretary-General in that initiative.

223. With respect to activities related to the system-wide preparation for and follow-up to United Nations conferences and summits, additional information was requested regarding the review by CEB of the implementation of the Millennium Development Goals at the country level. In addition, many delegations enquired about the role of CEB in assisting Member States in building the post-2015 development agenda, asked for elaboration regarding the initiative of the United Nations Development Group to undertake wide-ranging consultations, and stressed the importance of ensuring that the views of Member States were reflected in those consultations. Several delegations also enquired about the extent to which the Bretton Woods institutions were involved in the work of CEB.

224. In the light of the need for a coherent global framework for effective response to the very complex and interconnected challenges to be faced in the post-2015 United Nations development agenda, some delegations stressed the importance of ensuring integrated United Nations system-wide support so as to avoid the overlapping and duplication of efforts. In this context, they reaffirmed the key role to be played by CEB in fostering policy coherence, as well as in taking coordinated and effective action to address the wide range of programmatic, management and operational issues linked to that global agenda.

225. Several delegations noted that the annual report made reference to some conferences and summits but not to others, including the Fourth United Nations Conference on the Least Developed Countries, held in Istanbul in 2011, and sought clarification regarding the role of CEB in an upcoming event to be held in follow-up to the International Conference on Population and Development.

226. With regard to cooperation among the entities of the United Nations development system, delegations requested further information about the role of CEB in the preparation of General Assembly resolution 67/226 on the quadrennial comprehensive policy review of operational activities for development of the United Nations system and raised a question about the extent to which the capacity of country teams had been strengthened as a consequence of the work on United Nations Development Assistance Frameworks carried out at United Nations Development Group retreats, and whether there had been improvements on the ground as a result of that work. Additional information was requested about the Development Group toolkit on good practices and lessons learned that had been disseminated as part of efforts to strengthen system-wide knowledge management in order to facilitate contributions of the United Nations system to the Frameworks and other planning frameworks and mechanisms.

227. In relation to the harmonization and simplification of business practices, appreciation was expressed for that CEB initiative. Many delegations took note of the improvements and concrete results achieved and called for the continuation of the work in this area. A few delegations requested further information about the project relating to treasury services, which had yielded savings as a result of better exchange rates through collaboration, with a view to considering whether it should be recommended that the project be expanded. Other delegations commended work undertaken to increase access to United Nations system procurement for vendors

from developing countries, and asked for more details to be provided about the outcome of that initiative. A question was raised as to whether the guidelines for or approach to the harmonization of business practices had been customized for use in countries engaged in or emerging from conflict.

228. In respect of the International Public Sector Accounting Standards, an enquiry was made regarding the status of their implementation throughout the United Nations system.

229. Delegations made a number of observations on the subject of strategic planning in the United Nations system. The view was expressed that strategic planning was a substantial component of coordination and that CEB should bring that issue to the attention of its members so that they could identify ways to improve system-wide coordination in that area.

Conclusions and recommendations

230. **The Committee reaffirmed the importance of achieving the Millennium Development Goals and welcomed the periodic review by CEB of their implementation at the country level, as well as the Board's support for Member States. The Committee recommended that the General Assembly request the Secretary-General, in his capacity as Chair of CEB, to ensure the continuation of that support.**

231. **The Committee emphasized the key role to be played by CEB in ensuring coordinated United Nations system-wide support in the preparation of and follow-up to the post-2015 United Nations development agenda, in accordance with relevant intergovernmental mandates. To that end, the Committee recommended that the General Assembly request the Secretary-General, in his capacity as Chair of CEB, to report to the Committee, in the context of its annual overview report to be submitted for consideration at its fifty-fifth session, on ways and means of strengthening that role to foster policy coherence in the United Nations system in order to ensure coordinated and effective action to address the wide range of programmatic, management and operational issues linked to that global agenda.**

232. **The Committee reaffirmed the importance of continuing the dialogue between CEB and Member States in order to further improve the Board's transparency and accountability with respect to Member States, and noted the efforts made by CEB in this area, in particular the improvements to the Board's website. It recommended that the General Assembly request the Secretary-General, in his capacity as Chair of CEB, to ensure the continuation of those efforts.**

233. **The Committee recognized the work of CEB on the harmonization and simplification of business practices, and welcomed the instances in which opportunities for efficiencies and the reduction of administrative and procedural burdens had been created. In that regard, the Committee requested that it be informed of future progress and recommended that the General Assembly bring to the attention of the Secretary-General, in his capacity as Chair of CEB, the need to continue to better address that issue.**

234. **The Committee noted that some of its recommendations endorsed by the General Assembly had not been implemented, and therefore reiterated its**

recommendations to the Assembly to bring to the attention of the Secretary-General, in his capacity as Chair of CEB, the following concerns:

(a) The need to ensure that the Board's activities and initiatives, including those related to system-wide coherence, which also included "Delivering as one" as defined in section IV.C of resolution 67/226, were in line with intergovernmental mandates;

(b) The need to ensure the enhanced alignment of the measures of the High-level Committee on Management with the existing United Nations legislative framework, including in the area of procurement.

235. **With regard to the annex to the report containing a summary of the status of implementation of the Committee's conclusions and recommendations, the Committee recommended that the General Assembly request the Secretary-General, in his capacity as Chair of CEB, to ensure that in future such summaries would be improved and evidence-based.**

236. **The Committee recommended that the General Assembly request the Secretary-General, in his capacity as Chair of CEB, to continue to facilitate opportunities for developing countries and countries with economies in transition in the procurement processes of the United Nations system, in accordance with existing rules and regulations.**

B. United Nations system support for the New Partnership for Africa's Development

237. At its 12th meeting, on 12 June 2013, the Committee considered the report of the Secretary-General on United Nations system support for the New Partnership for Africa's Development (NEPAD) (E/AC.51/2013/6).

238. The Under-Secretary-General and Special Adviser on Africa introduced the report and responded to questions raised during the Committee's consideration of the report.

Discussion

239. In view of the ongoing health situation of President Nelson Mandela, all delegations acknowledged the President's significant lifelong contribution to South Africa and humanity, and expressed their wishes for his speedy recovery.

240. Delegations commended the Office of the Special Adviser on Africa for the comprehensiveness of the report. Moreover, they welcomed and expressed support for the work of the Office, in particular its role as coordinator of United Nations system support for NEPAD.

241. Delegations reaffirmed the priority of Africa in the global agenda and reiterated the importance of stepping up coordinated United Nations system support for all sectoral priorities of the Organization's work on Africa. They observed some decline in the financial and staff resources devoted to Africa by some entities of the United Nations system. Some delegations expressed the need to align United Nations system support budget planning with the national and regional priorities of the African continent.

242. Delegations emphasized the need to continue to strengthen coherence within the United Nations system in support of Africa's development, in particular with respect to the ongoing consultations on the post-2015 development agenda. In that regard, some delegations emphasized the need to closely coordinate that process with the sustainable development goals, as mandated by the United Nations Conference on Sustainable Development, to ensure the continuation of United Nations support for the implementation of the Millennium Development Goals, in particular poverty eradication and health, and to ensure that sustainable development was central to the post-2015 development agenda.

243. While appreciating the significant achievements in economic, social and political issues, some delegations stressed that the post-2015 development agenda should take due consideration of the economic development challenges facing Africa, including emerging challenges such as climate change, the global financial and economic crisis, the food crisis and commodity price volatility.

244. Delegations emphasized the need to align the post-2015 development agenda with the priorities of Africa, as articulated in the Strategic Plan 2014-2017 recently adopted by the African Union Commission. Delegations also emphasized that the post-2015 development agenda should build on the successes of the Millennium Development Goals and focus on structural transformation and inclusive growth, innovation and education and human and social development.

245. Some delegations stressed the importance of the nexus between peace, security and development, and welcomed the increasing partnerships in support of Africa's development, including the TICAD (Tokyo International Conference on African Development) process, the Forum on China-Africa Cooperation and other bilateral strategic partnerships with Africa. In that regard, some delegations emphasized the need to strengthen the Office of the Special Adviser on Africa with adequate resources to enable it to effectively coordinate all the multilateral initiatives in support of Africa's development and to provide better support for the NEPAD Planning and Coordinating Agency in the implementation of its priority areas, notably agriculture, through the Comprehensive Africa Agriculture Development Programme, infrastructure development, through the Programme for Infrastructure Development in Africa, market access and trade facilitation, human and social development, and science and technology.

246. Delegations expressed support for United Nations monitoring of the Regional Coordination Mechanism, in particular on progress achieved in the implementation of the 10-year capacity-building programme for the African Union. Some delegations supported the call for a joint United Nations/African Union resource mobilization strategy and the creation of a trust fund to facilitate the implementation and coordination of activities of the business plans of the clusters within the Regional Coordination Mechanism. Delegations encouraged the various clusters to share more information among and between one another, to set up baselines and realistic targets and to show greater willingness and readiness to engage with one another.

247. Delegations emphasized the need to better mainstream the cross-cutting issues of the Regional Coordination Mechanism in the work of relevant clusters, thereby enabling the Mechanism more effectively to provide the necessary technical support to the African Union Commission, the NEPAD Planning and Coordinating Agency

and the regional economic communities, and to better facilitate the implementation of the multisectoral capacity-building programmes.

248. Delegations expressed the view that Africa's transition towards a green economy in the context of sustainable development and poverty eradication should be viewed within the implementation of the outcome document of the United Nations Conference on Sustainable Development.

249. Delegations expressed their appreciation for the analysis given in paragraph 105 of the report, summarizing the challenges and constraints in the areas under consideration.

Conclusions and recommendations

250. **The Committee welcomed the annual report of the Secretary-General on United Nations system support for NEPAD (E/AC.51/2013/6) and recommended that the General Assembly endorse the conclusions and recommendations contained in paragraphs 106 to 114 of the report.**

251. **The Committee recommended that the General Assembly request the Secretary-General to include, in his future reports, detailed information related to the possible outcomes of the achievements of NEPAD targets.**

252. **The Committee also recommended that the General Assembly reiterate its request to the organizations of the United Nations system to continue to promote greater coherence in their work in support of NEPAD, on the basis of the agreed clusters of the Regional Coordination Mechanism in Africa, and called upon the United Nations system to continue to mainstream the special needs of Africa in all of its normative and operational activities, including the financing of programmes and projects, resource mobilization and humanitarian assistance.**

253. **The Committee further recommended that the General Assembly request the organizations of the United Nations system to continue to coordinate closely with the NEPAD Planning and Coordinating Agency, as the technical body of the African Union, and other structures of the African Union Commission and the Partnership in order to further strengthen the implementation of the African Union/NEPAD African Action Plan 2010-2015.**

254. **The Committee recommended that the General Assembly emphasize the need for the organizations of the United Nations system and intergovernmental bodies to continue to fully take into account the views, comments and/or input of the African Union and other regional mechanisms in their policy formulation and decision-making, including in the areas of mediation, political affairs and peace and security.**

255. **The Committee reiterated its recommendation that the reports of the Secretary-General on NEPAD include information not only on seminars, workshops and meetings but also on other tangible actions and results in respect of United Nations system support for projects of the Partnership throughout the African continent, while stressing that future reports should further enhance the focus on the impact, in both quantitative and qualitative terms, of the activities implemented by entities of the United Nations system in support of the Partnership, with respect to the resources.**

256. **The Committee recognized the important role played by the development of hard infrastructure in Africa, in particular the railroads and highways, and recommended that the General Assembly request the Secretary-General to intensify his efforts in mobilizing United Nations system support in that area, in particular for the initiatives of the regional economic communities.**

Chapter IV
Reports of the Joint Inspection Unit

257. The Committee expressed satisfaction that the reports of the Joint Inspection Unit were once again being submitted for its consideration after a lapse in recent years, and reaffirmed that one of the key mandates of the Committee was to assist the Economic and Social Council and the General Assembly on coordination questions, as reflected in the recommendation adopted at its 52nd session urging the Unit to intensify its efforts to introduce relevant reports to the Committee.

258. The Committee emphasized the need for implementation of all the recommendations of the Joint Inspection Unit that have been endorsed by intergovernmental bodies and recommended that the General Assembly request the Secretary-General to invite the executive heads of the participating organizations to provide their relevant intergovernmental bodies with the reasons for the delay or non-implementation of the recommendations addressed to them.

A. Strategic planning in the United Nations system

259. At its sixth meeting, on 5 June 2013, the Committee considered the report of the Joint Inspection Unit entitled "Strategic planning in the United Nations system" (A/67/873), as well as the comments of the Secretary-General and of CEB thereon (A/67/873/Add.1).

260. Inspector Tadanori Inomata of the Joint Inspection Unit introduced the report and responded to queries raised during its consideration by the Committee. The representative of CEB introduced the report containing the comments of the Secretary-General and CEB thereon and responded to queries raised.

Discussion

261. Delegations expressed satisfaction that the reports of the Joint Inspection Unit were once again being submitted to the Committee for its consideration after a gap of several years. In this regard, it was reaffirmed that one of the key mandates of the Committee was to assist the Economic and Social Council and the General Assembly with coordination questions, as reflected in the recommendation adopted last year urging the Joint Inspection Unit to intensify its efforts to introduce relevant reports to the Committee.

262. Many delegations expressed appreciation for the pertinent selection of strategic planning for the report of the Joint Inspection Unit and welcomed, in general, most of the recommendations contained therein. In addition, delegations reasserted the role of the Committee in strategic planning, in translating such planning into programmes and in ensuring the coordination of its application within the United Nations system. Delegations expressed the view that the report provided the Committee with a timely opportunity to strengthen its function in this regard.

263. Several delegations referred to the reluctance of certain organizations to participate in system-wide strategic planning, as referred to in the report, and they questioned how such planning as called for in recommendation 1 could be implemented. Some delegations indicated that a process of prior consultation, in order to ensure coordination of medium-term planning with the concerned specialized

agencies, should have been implemented in accordance with regulation 4.9 of Regulations and Rules Governing Programme Planning, and the Programme Aspects of the Budget, the Monitoring of Implementation and the Methods of Evaluation (ST/SGB/2000/8).

264. Clarification was sought as to why the report presented a broad analysis of the entire process of programming, planning, budgeting, monitoring of implementation and the evaluation process rather than focusing on strategic planning.

265. Several delegations queried how an overarching strategic framework could be constructed to ensure follow-up to the outcome of the United Nations Conference on Sustainable Development, in particular towards the preparation of sustainable goals post-2015, anticipating daunting challenges ahead for the secretariats of the organizations of the common system, as well as for Member States.

266. Furthermore, concerning the post-2015 development agenda, some delegations stressed the importance of a more unified and consistent strategic planning process. In this regard, they reaffirmed the need to ensure the integrated system-wide support of the United Nations in implementing the post-2015 agenda worldwide in light of its intersectoral and interdisciplinary dimensions. With a view to setting up a coherent overarching framework, they pointed out the need for ensuring action at the global, regional and country levels, as well as for working across sectoral frontiers on the basis of common goals, jointly agreed strategies and platform-specific results. They also characterized the post-2015 development agenda as one of the greatest challenges to be faced by the United Nations system-wide in terms of coordination and strategic planning.

267. Some delegations expressed appreciation regarding the history of the strategic planning concept in the United Nations system, as defined and described in the report of the Joint Inspection Unit, including its origin and evolution over the years, and it was recognized that the background helped in reconciling the long-term perspective of the strategic framework with the shorter range plans involved in each organization's mandate. The Committee noted with concern, however, that the outcome of the review had concluded that at present there is a lack of strategic planning in the United Nations system.

268. Several delegations noted that the strategic framework is neither a medium-term plan nor a system-wide instrument and sought clarification as to why the United Nations had replaced the medium-term plan, with its system-wide scope. A number of delegations recalled that at the end of paragraph 44 of the report, the Joint Inspection Unit had stated that in examining 2014-2015 strategic framework of the United Nations, the Secretary-General had proposed, and the Committee for Programme and Coordination had agreed, to reiterate the importance of the longer-term objectives of the Organization as an instrument of full achievement of its goals.

269. A few delegations noted the role played over the years by the medium-term plan as a principal planning document, enabling the translation of legislative mandates into programmes and subprogrammes and covering a period of up to six years. In this regard, the Committee noted that the plan was intended to cover the United Nations system. The Committee also recognized that the report aimed to present pragmatic tools and managerial good practices for better system-wide coordination that had already been adopted by some organizations of the United Nations system in specific sectors.

270. Some delegations expressed concern at the proliferation of "corporate strategies" or strategic plans adopted in house at the executive level without scrutiny by Member States. Notably, views were expressed that the application of somewhat sophisticated management concepts prevailing in corporate governance as well as across-the-board initiatives such as "Delivering as one" might not be of universal interest to Member States in meeting their needs for eradication of poverty and achieving sustainable development, particularly in the least developed countries.

271. A number of delegations sought information on the status of the five-year agenda of the Secretary-General as well as on the current work of the Change Management Group.

272. A few delegations sought clarification about the added value of harmonizing planning terminology, and questioned whether it would not be more valuable to produce a glossary reflecting diversity in the terms used in the organizations of the common system.

273. A few delegations expressed appreciation for the frank observations on the presumed impact of the Committee's working procedures on the planning process, which is not devoted to substantive debate but rather to textual concordance with the legislative basis for the formulation of the strategic framework. At the same time, other delegations expressed concern about the need for further review of the Committee's working procedures, and stated that neither the mandates of the Fifth Committee nor the Committee itself needed to be re-examined. They remained ready, however, to embark on discussions relating to changes in procedures and the tools and instruments used in planning.

274. Concern was expressed by one delegation regarding a degree of non-compliance by the Secretariat with the provisions of regulation 4.9 of the Regulations and Rules Governing Programme Planning, the Programme Aspects of the Budget, the Monitoring of Implementation and the Methods of Evaluation relating to the submission of proposals on the relevant portions of the strategic framework or its revisions to sectoral, functional and regional bodies for their review, with a view to facilitating the work of the Committee, despite the decisions of the General Assembly requesting their submission.

275. Many delegations shared the view that a strategic plan should not be budget-driven but mandate-driven. In this context, doubt was expressed about the possibility for the full implementation of mandated programmes under the current zero-nominal-growth and reduction-of-budget situations. Other delegations expressed the view that the addition of results-based management dimensions to strategic planning frameworks would be a natural tool for implementing strategic planning. One delegation took a different view, questioning the comments of the Joint Inspection Unit on the "disjointed allocation of regular and extrabudgetary resources", and suggesting that strategic planning could not be conducted in a vacuum with no regard for resource issues.

276. Many delegations considered that the establishment of objectives and mandates of organizations is the prerogative of Member States and that the Secretariat must implement them. Furthermore, if system-wide coherence is ensured at the planning stage, the United Nations system would be able to avoid the duplication of efforts and waste. A few delegations emphasized the need for strengthening the function of the Committee in system-wide programme planning

and coordination, including through enhanced consultation with the executive heads of organizations of the common system.

Conclusions and recommendations

277. **The Committee recalled paragraph 3 of General Assembly resolution 63/247 and stressed that setting priorities of the United Nations is the prerogative of the Member States, as reflected in legislative mandates.**

278. **The Committee also recalled General Assembly resolution 67/236 and reaffirmed its role as the main subsidiary organ of the General Assembly and the Economic and Social Council for planning, programming and coordination.**

279. **The Committee further recalled General Assembly resolution 67/248 and reaffirmed that the Fifth Committee is the appropriate Main Committee of the General Assembly entrusted with responsibilities for administrative and budgetary matters.**

280. **The Committee took note of the report of the Joint Inspection Unit on strategic planning in the United Nations system (A/67/873), in particular the recommendations contained therein.**

281. **The Committee noted that the report presented a set of recommendations aiming at replicating the strategic planning of some organizations with a view to harmonizing or aligning the planning cycles of the different entities of the United Nations system.**

282. **Considering that the post-2015 development agenda posed one of the greatest challenges to the United Nations, system-wide, in terms of coordination and strategic planning, the Committee emphasized the importance of a more unified and consistent strategic process to its implementation, in particular in view of its intersectoral and interdisciplinary dimensions and in accordance with relevant intergovernmental mandates. With a view to setting up one integrated post-2015 framework, the Committee stressed the need for ensuring action and working across sectoral frontiers on the basis of common goals, jointly agreed-upon strategies and platform-specific results.**

283. **The Committee recognized that the further development and implementation of the results-based management may potentially contribute to the establishment of common goals on the basis of the priorities identified by the Member States.**

284. **The Committee recommended that the General Assembly request the Secretary-General to fully implement regulation 4.9 of the Regulations and Rules Governing Programme Planning, the Programme Aspects of the Budget, the Monitoring of Implementation and the Methods of Evaluation.**

B. Financing for humanitarian operations in the United Nations system

285. At its fifth meeting, on 5 June 2013, the Committee considered the report of the Joint Inspection Unit, entitled "Financing for humanitarian operations in the United Nations system" (A/67/867), as well as the comments thereon of the Secretary-General and of CEB (A/67/867/Add.1).

286. Inspector Tadanori Inomata introduced the Joint Inspection Unit report and responded to queries raised during its consideration by the Committee. A representative of CEB introduced the report containing the comments of the Secretary-General and CEB.

Discussion

287. A number of delegations generally supported the findings and recommendations of the report. In particular, delegations expressed appreciation with the richness of the information and excellent analyses provided as well as the concise summary of actions proposed for Member States and executive heads of organizations concerned.

288. Several delegations expressed satisfaction at having the reports of the JIU before the Committee for review following the absence of such reports over the past years, which weakened the coordinating role of the Committee as mandated by the General Assembly.

289. Many delegations stressed the role of the Committee in system-wide coordination among programmes of the United Nations system organizations. In addition, views were expressed that the report of Joint Inspection Unit coincided with the aim of the Organization to provide a global governance framework on humanitarian operations in the system and had provided the Committee with a timely opportunity to strengthen its function with respect to humanitarian operations. Some delegations were of the view that the report should also be considered by the Economic and Social Council at its humanitarian segment and by the Second and Third committees of the General Assembly.

290. Clarification was sought by some delegations as to the scope of the report in relation to past reports prepared by the Joint Inspection Unit addressing similar subjects. A number of delegations queried where they could find information on the effect of previous recommendations in reports of the Unit in this domain, where the organizations of the United Nations system stood and how past recommendations could be compared with those that had been put forward in the report under consideration. Views were expressed regarding the guidance needed to understand the degree of success of past recommendations in relation to the current ones. Delegations expressed positive comments regarding the web-based follow-up system of recommendations made by the Unit.

291. Some delegations sought clarification regarding the methodology used to carry out the review, for example, the extent to which on-the-spot interviews and ad hoc inquiries had been carried out and the use of questionnaires. The delegations noted the wide scope of the review, aimed at identifying in a comprehensive way the numerous funding mechanisms of humanitarian operations within the United Nations system. A delegation further noted that, according to paragraph 8 of the report, the methodology applied for collecting data on the subject under review had included travel by the Inspector himself to several locations in different geographical areas. The delegation was of the view that the collection of data and conduct of interviews should take place through the most economical means of communication.

292. Several delegations expressed views and sought clarification regarding the predictability and the assured basis of funding, including the use of regular and core

resources versus extrabudgetary and earmarked contributions. A number of delegations queried why the member organizations of CEB were keen on the role of cash and in-kind contributions from the private sector and individuals during major humanitarian crises.

293. Some delegations underlined the civilian character of humanitarian assistance, while noting the possibility that military assets might be used in humanitarian operations. The delegations also explored an approach that would develop separate analyses and different governance frameworks for the delivery of assistance to respond to natural disasters and complex emergencies.

294. Many delegations stressed the need for smooth transition financing through the stages of emergency, early recovery, recovery through reconstruction and strengthening of resilience to disasters. Views were expressed that the dichotomy between humanitarian assistance and development aid, including early recovery activities, should be overcome. Some delegations held the view that humanitarian financing was not confined to developing countries, referring to the recent nuclear and natural disasters in Japan and to other natural disasters in Central Europe. A few delegations were concerned about the possible impact of the growth in humanitarian assistance on the overall availability of official development assistance. Many delegations expressed interest in identifying a means to better combine development aid with humanitarian assistance in such a way so as not to duplicate the use of both resources, and reflected on the feasibility of drawing on lessons of experience from the integrated strategic plans and frameworks of the United Nations integrated missions as well as the Common Humanitarian Action Plans and the United Nations Development Assistance Framework processes of the United Nations country teams.

295. A number of delegations expressed appreciation in principle for the general thrust of the recommendations presented in the report, in particular recommendations 2, 6 and 8 aimed at facilitating the financing of humanitarian operations in the field, and noted the intention of the Joint Inspection Unit to present them to the agencies dealing with humanitarian assistance. A number of delegations expressed interest in developing, as reflected in recommendation 6 of the report, a system-wide policy for the United Nations organizations to provide capacity-building assistance for national insurance schemes with the necessary synergy among them. With regard to recommendation 8, some delegations expressed the preference that better use be made of existing processes and warned against establishing another bureaucratic process.

Conclusions and recommendations

296. **The Committee took note of the report of the Joint Inspection Unit on financing for humanitarian operations in the United Nations system (A/67/867) and recommended that the General Assembly endorse the recommendations contained in the report.**

297. **The Committee further recommended that, while endorsing recommendation 1, the General Assembly request the Secretary-General, in his capacity as Chair of CEB, to replace the phrase "disaster-prone countries and countries in fragile situations" with the phrase "countries emerging from conflicts or recovering from natural disasters".**

298. **The Committee noted the wide scope of the review, which aimed to identify in a comprehensive manner the funding mechanisms for humanitarian operations within the United Nations system, and the Committee appreciated the general thrust of the recommendations presented in the report of the Joint Inspection Unit aimed at providing a strategic planning framework for financing humanitarian operations.**

299. **The Committee further noted that in the process of collecting data, the most effective and efficient methodology should be applied.**

300. **The Committee recommended that the Joint Inspection Unit continue to monitor the implementation of its recommendations as approved by the relevant intergovernmental bodies in order to ensure the effectiveness of humanitarian action.**

Chapter V

Provisional agenda for the fifty-fourth session of the Committee

301. In accordance with paragraph 2 (e) of Economic and Social Council resolution 1979/41 and paragraph 2 of General Assembly resolution 34/50, the Committee shall submit to the Council and to the Assembly, for their review, the provisional agenda for its fifty-fourth session, together with the required documentation.

302. In its decision 1983/163, the Economic and Social Council requested the Secretary-General to bring to the attention of intergovernmental and expert bodies, before decisions were adopted, any request for documentation that exceeded the ability of the Secretariat to prepare and process on time and within its approved resources, and to draw the attention of intergovernmental bodies to areas where duplication of documentation was likely to occur and/or where opportunities for integrating or consolidating documents that dealt with related or similar themes might exist, with a view to rationalizing documentation.

303. The draft provisional agenda for the fifty-fourth session of the Committee is set out below. It has been prepared on the basis of existing legislative mandates and will be completed at the end of the present session in the light of the recommendations adopted by the Committee.

Draft provisional agenda for the fifty-fourth session of the Committee

1. Election of officers.
2. Adoption of the agenda and organization of work.
3. Programme questions:
   (a) Programme performance;

   Documentation

   Report of the Secretary-General on programme performance for the biennium 2012-2013

   (b) Programme planning;

   Report of the Secretary-General on the proposed strategic framework for the period 2016-2017: part one, plan outline, and part two, biennial programme plan (General Assembly resolutions 59/275, 62/224 and 67/236)

   (c) Evaluation.

   Documentation

   Report of the Office of Internal Oversight Services on the triennial review of the implementation of recommendations made by the Committee for Programme and Coordination at its forty-ninth session on the programme evaluation of the Department of Economic and Social Affairs

4. Coordination questions:

   (a) Report of the United Nations System Chief Executives Board for Coordination;

   Documentation

   Annual overview report of the United Nations System Chief Executives Board for Coordination for 2013

   (b) New Partnership for Africa's Development.

   Documentation

   Report of the Secretary-General on United Nations system support for the New Partnership for Africa's Development (General Assembly resolution 59/275)

5. Report(s) of the Joint Inspection Unit.

6. Provisional agenda for the fifty-fifth session.

7. Adoption of the report of the Committee on its fifty-fourth session.

Annex I

Agenda for the fifty-third session of the Committee

1. Election of officers.
2. Adoption of the agenda and organization of work.
3. Programme questions:
   (a) Proposed programme budget for the biennium 2014-2015;
   (b) Evaluation.
4. Coordination questions:
   (a) Report of the United Nations System Chief Executives Board for Coordination;
   (b) New Partnership for Africa's Development.
5. Report(s) of the Joint Inspection Unit.
6. Provisional agenda for the fifty-fourth session.
7. Adoption of the report of the Committee on its fifty-third session.

Annex II

List of documents before the Committee at its fifty-third session

A/68/75	Report of the Secretary-General on consolidated changes to the biennial programme plan as reflected in the proposed programme budget for the biennium 2014-2015
A/67/6/Rev.1	Biennial programme plan and priorities for the period 2014-2015
A/68/6 (Sect. 4) and Corr.1	Disarmament
A/68/6 (Sect. 12)	Trade and development
A/68/6 (Sect. 14)	Environment
A/68/6 (Sect. 15)	Human settlements
A/68/6 (Sect. 18)	Economic and social development in Africa
A/68/6 (Sect. 19)	Economic and social development in Asia and the Pacific
A/68/74 and Corr.1	Report of the Secretary-General on proposed revisions to the Regulations and Rules Governing Programme Planning, the Programme Aspects of the Budget, Monitoring of Implementation and the Methods of Evaluation
A/68/70	Report of the Office of Internal Oversight Services on strengthening the role of evaluation and the application of evaluation findings on programme design, delivery and policy directives
A/67/873	Note by the Secretary-General transmitting the report of the Joint Inspection Unit entitled "Strategic planning in the United Nations system"
A/67/873/Add.1	Note by the Secretary-General transmitting his comments and those of the United Nations System Chief Executives Board for Coordination on the report of the Joint Inspection Unit entitled "Strategic planning in the United Nations system"
A/67/867	Note by the Secretary-General transmitting the report of the Joint Inspection Unit entitled "Financing for humanitarian operations in the United Nations system"
A/67/867/Add.1	Note by the Secretary-General transmitting his comments and those of the United Nations System Chief Executives Board for Coordination on the report of the Joint Inspection Unit entitled "Financing for humanitarian operations in the United Nations system"
E/2013/60	Annual overview report of the United Nations System Chief Executives Board for Coordination for 2012
E/AC.51/2013/1	Annotated provisional agenda

E/AC.51/2013/2	Report of the Office of Internal Oversight Services on programme evaluation of the United Nations Environment Programme
E/AC.51/2013/3	Report of the Office of Internal Oversight Services on evaluation of the Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs
E/AC.51/2013/4	Report of the Office of Internal Oversight Services on evaluation of the United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime
E/AC.51/2013/5	Report of the Office of Internal Oversight Services on review of the evaluation capacity of the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees
E/AC.51/2013/6	Report of the Secretary-General on United Nations system support for the New Partnership for Africa's Development
E/AC.51/2013/L.1/Rev.1	Note by the Secretariat on the status of documentation
E/AC.51/2013/L.2	Note by the Secretariat on report(s) of the Joint Inspection Unit
E/AC.51/2013/L.3	Note by the Secretariat on the draft provisional agenda for the fifty-fourth session of the Committee
E/AC.51/2013/L.4 and Add.1-18	Draft report
E/AC.51/2011/INF/1/Rev.1	List of delegations

13-38440 (E) 140813